PAN-EUROPA

Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi

PAN-EUROPA

Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi

RICHARD NIKOLAUS COUDENHOVE-KALERGI

PAN-EUROPA

Published for the first time in 1923 by
PAN-EUROPA – EDITIONS – VIENNA-LEIPZIG

www.liberveritate.com

Traducción: Tabaré Salvagno

Contacto: tabaresalvagno@liberveritate.com

© 2019 - MMXIX

Contents

Preface
I.Europe and the World
1.The decline of European world hegemony
European world domination
The downfall of the European world hegemony
The future of Europe
2.Technique and politics
The world narrows
Political technique
3.World powers instead of big powers
Synthetic and analytical politics
The fields of international powers
4.The situation of Europe in the world
The union of Europe
Germany and Europe
The decadence of Europe
II.European borders
1.The decline of European world hegemony
The European peninsula
Geography, politics, civilization
2.Historical borders of Europe
The Stages of the European evolution
The future of the European borders
3.European civilization
The European civilization
The division of the European civilization
4.Pan-Europa
The limits of Pan-Europa
The Relative extension of Pan-Europa
III.Europe and England
1.Small or big Europe?
A previous question
The small Germany and the great Germany
The small Europe instead of and the great Europe
Great Britain as an intercontinental empire
2.Pan-Europa and England
England and the peace

The security of England
The interest of Europe for England
3.Anglo-European entente
Anglo-European accord
IV.Europe and Russia
1.Hellas as a warning
Pan-Hellenism
2.The Russian danger
The Danger of a Russian invasion
The march of Russia towards Occident
World War and world revolution
Red danger and White danger
3.European guarantee pact
European solidarity
4.Balance and disarmament
Economic cooperation
World disarmament
V.Europe and America
1.The United States of America and the disunited States of Europe
The situation of America and Europa
Europe incapacity to face the competition
The salvation of Europe
2.Pan-America
The Pan-American union
The Pan-American evolution
Pan-Americanism
3.Pan-America and Pan-Europa
Pan-America, Pan-Europa
Pan-America as a model
Clear separation
England as intermediary
VI.Europe and the League of Nations
1.Critique to the League of Nations
The failure of Geneva
Inorganic structure
2.Pan-Europa and the League of Nations
Geneva and Moscow
Europe: political object of the League of Nations

3.The Reorganization of the League of Nations
Group of States
Federalism between States
Intercontinental balance
Washington and Geneva
VII.The danger of a new war in Europe
1.Danger of war
The European anarchy
Organization instead of anarchy
2.The war of the future
The war of extermination
No European victory would be rentable
The struggle for peace: a national duty
3.Pan-Europa and the peace
Conference previous of the war, not after the war
Pan-Europa, the path towards the peace
The external peace of Europe
VIII.Europe after the war
1.The liberation of Eastern Europe
Metternich and Mazzini
National oppression past and present
2.European politics and economy
Economic consequences of the peace treaty
Economic reconstruction of Europe
3.Pan-Europa and Versailles
Versailles and the peace
European customs union
4.The Small Entente
The United States of Eastern Europe
The Small Entente
IX.Germany and France
1.The Central European problem
Historical rivalry
Germany and France: sister republics
Franco-German hereditary enmity
2.France in the crossroads
Politics of destruction and reconciliation
Path to destruction
Path to reconciliation

3.Germany in the crossroads
Revenge politics of Germany
German politics of reconciliation
4.Chauvinists and Europeans
Logic and inconsistency
Chauvinism and Europeanism
X.The national question
1.The essence of the nation
The European nations as a mix of peoples
The nation as a spiritual community
The nation as a Church
National chauvinism
2.The European nation
The European pantheon
The European nation
3.Nation and borders
The minorities question
Separation between State and nation
Suppression instead of rectification of borders
XI.Paths towards Pan-Europa
1.The stages for the development of Pan-Europa
Pan-European conference
Mediation treaty
Customs union
Pan-European constitution
2.Pan-Europa and the States
Advantages of the federation
The African colony
3.Pan-Europa and the political parties
Pan-Europa and democracy
Bourgeoisie and socialism
4.The adversaries of Pan-Europa
The enemies of Pan-Europa
Customs protection and free exchange
5.The Pan-European union
Pan-Europeans and anti-Europeans
Pan-European union
Annex

The man and the movement. A biographical outline of Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi

Preface

All great historical events begin under a utopian form and finish becoming a reality

The objective of this book is the awakening of a big political movement that still sleeps within all European peoples.

Many are the men that dreamt with a united Europe, but few are decided to create it. Sterile as a goal from desire, this idea could be fruitful if converted as an objective of the will.

The will of the Europeans behold the only force that could make real to Pan-Europa.

Each one of the Europeans has therefore in their hands a part of the fate of their own world.

At the very moment of writing these lines, the V Pan-American Conference is reuniting in Chile, Russia is working for her reconstruction with all the energy that is capable of, the British Empire is surpassing the crisis following the war and the Far East is free of the Damocles' sword, the danger of an American war. Meanwhile, Europe is tumbling, with no guide and without plan, from one crisis to another. The French and Belgium soldiers continue to occupy the industrial center of Germany. Over Thrace is pending the daily menace of a new war. Everywhere the misery reigns, the anxiety, the discontent, the hate and the fear.

While the rest of the world each day takes a step forward, Europe each day takes a step back.

This understanding constitutes itself a program.

The cause for the decadence of Europe is political, no biological. Europe dies not from old age, but because her inhabitants kill and destroy one another with all the means of modern technique.

Europe is still the most qualitative fertile human reserve of the world. The dynamic Americans are just Europeans transplanted to a new political environment. The European Peoples are not suffering from senility but only her political system. The radical transformation of this system could and should give place to the total cure of this ill continent.

The World War has transformed the political map of Europe, but not her political system. In Europe continues reigning the international anarchy, the oppression of the weak by the strong, a continuous state of potential war, the economic break-down, political intrigue. European politics of today resembles more from politics from the past than of the future.

Europe has her sight looking to the past instead of the future. The book market is full of memories. In the public debate the discussion focuses more on the causes of the last war rather than how to avoid the next.

This eternal look towards the past is the main cause of the reactionary movement and of the division of Europe. The European youth has the duty to modify this state of things. The European youth is called to raise this *New Europe* among the ruins of the old: to replace the anarchical Europe for an organized Europe.

If the European statesmen neglect to recognize and fulfill this objective, they will be erased by the peoples whose fates they are playing with.

There are two big problems pending over our continent: the *social* question and the *European* question; the class struggle and the war between European states.

The *social question* is the number one in the public discourse: originates and divides the political parties and appears thousands time over the public opinion from all countries.

Nevertheless, the *European question*, that has no lesser importance, *is never mentioned*. Most people have not even heard about it. It is a problem only relegated to the literature and utopian circles, no one takes it seriously.

However, from its solution depends the future of our culture and our children.

The *European question* is presented in these terms: Could Europe, with her political and economic division, guarantee her peace and independence from the extra-European powers or would be forced to organize it in a federation of States to save her existence?

To present this question is to answer it. Thus, no one presents it, and everyone avoids it. It is true that in the public discourse much is talked about European matters, but never about the *European Question*, in which all the others have their roots, in the same manner the social matters have their roots in the general Social Question.

As well as every European is demanded, in matters of internal policies, to adopt a position in front of the Social Question, in the same manner, in matters of external policies he will be demanded to adopt a position in front of the European Question.

But there is one thing that could never happen again: that the responsible politicians avoid a question that is vital for 300 million of their subjects.

In a word, the *European Question* must be discussed lengthily before the public opinion of the continent, in the press, in the political literature, in the political meetings, in the parliaments and in the governments.

The time is lacking. Tomorrow could be too late to resolve the European Question: thus, is preferable to start right away.

Europe, that has almost lost all confidence, waits for help from outside: some from *Russia*, others from *America*.

Both hopes represent a danger of death for Europe. Nor the East nor the West wants to save Europe: Russia wants to conquer it, America wants to buy it.

Between the Scylla of the military dictatorship and the Charybdis of the American financial dictatorship there is only one narrow way that leads to a better future. This way is called *Pan-Europa* and signifies that: Europe must help herself by *constituting herself in a Political-Economic union*.

Pan-Europa will be accused of being a utopia. But this accusation hast no grounds. There is no natural law that opposes to its completion. It responds to the interests of most of the Europeans and only stands against the interests of a small minority which is smaller every day.

This small minority, which is powerful and that is currently directing the fates of Europe, would want to put the seal of utopia to the idea of a Pan-Europa. To those we should answer that *the greatest historical events begin in form of utopia and finish being a reality*.

In 1913, the Republics of Poland and Czechoslovakia were utopias. In 1919 they were a reality. In 1916, the victory of the Communists in Russia was a utopia. In 1917 it was a reality. Less the fantasy of a politician more will be the utopian realm and less the realm of possibility. The history of the world has more fantasy than his puppets and is full of a chain of surprises, of utopias becoming reality.

The fact that one idea stays just as a utopia or, to the contrary, become a reality depends normally of the number and the conviction of its defenders. While there are thousands that believe in Pan-Europa, it will be a utopia. When there will be millions that believe in it, will be a political program. As soon as it will be tens of millions that believe in it, will be reality.

The future of Pan-Europa will depend, therefore, that the first thousand defenders have the faith and power of persuasion needed to convince millions and to make the utopia of yesterday the reality of tomorrow.

I call to the European youth to fulfill this work.

Richard N. Coudenhove-Kalergi Vienna, Spring of 1923.

I. Europe and the World

It is impossible that this multitude of small European States could stay for a long time together with the four great empires of the future: Great Britain, Russia, America and the Far East.

1. The decline of European world hegemony

European world domination

The XIX century was the era of European domination over the world. The past Asian Empires of China, Persia and Turkey were in decadence and was not long after that the moment arrived, and they become in subjects of Europe. Africa was divided and, same as India and Australia, was dominated by Europe.

From this European world hegemony only America escaped, guided by the United States. The proclamation of the Monroe Doctrine signified the independence declaration of the American continent in respect of the European.

Despite of this American autonomy, Europe constituted the *center of the World*: world politics identified itself with European politics, its protagonists are the six greatest powers: *England, Russia, Germany, Austria-Hungary, France and Italy.*

The downfall of the European world hegemony

The first quarter of the XX century brought the downfall of the European world hegemony. Today, Europe is no longer the political center of power, nor the economic center nor the cultural center of the world. The world has emancipated from Europe. The main causes of this political revolution are the following:

1. THE CONSTITUTION, OUTSIDE EUROPE, OF A WORLDWIDE BRITISH EMPIRE thanks to the transformation of his internal structure. Before it was a European kingdom with extra-European colonies, but since the beginning of our century transformed into an *international federal* kingdom. The essential point, due to the foundation of the South-African Union, to the conquests made during the World War and the annexation of the Arab world, moved from the Atlantic Ocean to the Indian. England no longer dominates his worldwide oceanic kingdom, but only presides it as *primus inter pares*. From being a great European power, Great Britain came to be a world intercontinental power.
2. THE CREATION, OUTSIDE EUROPE, OF A WORLDWIDE RUSSIAN EMPIRE thanks to the transformation of her internal structure. The Empire of the Czars was before a European State with Asian colonies, but the Russian Revolution made disappear the Urals boundaries. Today, Russia es a federal kingdom without colonies with a bigger surface in Asia than in Europe. The Union of the Soviet Republics is now a *Euro-Asiatic world power*. Russia, that is almost at war with the European peoples, appears however, the defender of the freedom of the Asian peoples. The resignation of the democratic system from the part of Russia signifies to leave Europe politically. The occidental parts of Russia, that felt more attracted by Europe rather than Russia, separated themselves from her and united to the European political system (Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Bessarabia). The European Eastern border is not more represented by the Urals but by the political border between

Russia and the near democratic States. From a great world power, Russia became a Euro-Asiatic world power.

3. THE ASIAN EMANCIPATION. The birth of the great power of Japan and his victory over Russia represents the beginning of a new era. While Europe believed that the Eastern peoples were no other thing that object of his policies and economy, it was born in Far East a great power, which influence to the East of the old world was sooner greater than the one from Europe. The old world has added to his political power in the Atlantic, Europe, a second power in the Pacific: *Japan*. The world hegemony of the white race has diminished. Today, the Japanese people is, together with the Anglo-Saxon, the people most powerful of the world. The rise of Japan came with the increasing Europeanization and the militarization of China and the rest of the Asiatic peoples. The world power of Japan has finished the absolute dominion o the European peoples.

4. THE RISE OF AMERICA. In the second Hague Peace Conference appeared for the first time the representants from the American Republics acting as partners with the same rights than the European States. Since then, every year is increasing the international prestige of the South American States, that plays a crucial role in the League of Nations and have a sit in tribunals to decide over European affairs. At the same time, the *United States of America* has become the world leading power. Extending his influence on the South thanks to the Pan-American Union; on the East (Europe), extending his dominion thanks to his investors position; on the West (Far East), as keepers of the independence of China. This rise of the United States began with his victory over Spain and with his mediation between Russia and Japan, consolidated with the construction of the Panama Canal and his fleet and with the growing of his population and wealth and found his coronation with the World War, with his decisive intervention. Today, the United States of America is the richest, powerful and advanced Empire of the world.

5. THE DOWNFALL OF EUROPE. The World War annihilated a great power, the Austro-Hungarian, and mutilated another, the German. In the world politics nor

Germany nor the successors of Austria play no role. The last two European great powers, France and Italy, have gained territory through war, is true, but have suffered big losses in terms of men and money, that their position in world politics is resting now on unsafe grounds. Their influence goes beyond Europe, the Mediterranean and Africa is very limited. They are European powers of the first level but of second level in the world. While the other powers share the peoples and goods of the world and organize the continents, France keeps hypnotized by the Rhine and Italy by the Adriatic. The capacity for action of Europe over the world politics is paralyzed by her lack of unity.

Europe went from being the center of world to be the periphery.

The future of Europe

The world hegemony of Europe has fallen forever. Before, Europe was feared, now, compassion. She was forced to leave his dominant position and be in the defensive: militarily, menaced by a Russian invasion, economically, menaced by the American competition and in debt, divided, anxious and debilitated; torn-apart by national and social fights, gravely damaged in his demographic strength and in her industry, is plunged in economic and monetary chaos. From a desolated present step forward to an uncertain future.

The fact that the situation of Russia being still darker is not something that brings tranquility, because time works in favor of Russia and against Europe. The great riches of her soil and demographic resources, still to exploit and more homogeneous, guarantee the future of Russia. Whichever way the next future presents, Russia will be again, before or after, big, powerful and rich.

Europe, on the other hand, confronts an uncertain future. Its world hegemony lost because of lack of unity of its peoples and will lose her independence and the rest of its wellbeing if its peoples continue to be divided. The XX century witnessed the dethroning of Europe from this world hegemony and will witness, maybe, also her downfall. It will depend of her chiefs and her peoples, if they adapt to the requirements of the times or throw blindly from the precipice, to which every day they are approaching.

2. Technique and politics

The world narrows

The world is smaller every day: cause to the technical advancements and the means of communication, the cities and countries get closer every day more and more.

A distance is less measured by the length of the road than by its duration. It is not the number of miles or kilometers that counts, but the number of hours or days that the travel last. The objective measure of a distance is the length, the subjective measure is the duration.

Since the training of the horse or since the discovery of the candle until the XIX century has remained constant the relationship between the length and the duration of a distance. But with the discovery of the vapor boat, the train, the electric trolley, the automobile and the plane in the XIX and XX centuries changed this millennial relationship and appeared new ways of measuring distances.

At the same time, since a century ago the Earth is smaller. The cities and countries got closer to each other in the same way as a train runs faster than a coach, a plane faster than a rider, a transatlantic ship faster than a sailboat, a telegram faster than a messenger pigeon. For this reason, every State have narrowed and got closer to each other.

Whereas, during the times of king Ottokar, the kingdom of Bohemia was a great power, with an approximated extension of the European Russia, the current Bohemia is little like it was a century ago the Great Ducky of Weimar: it takes the same time to cross the two regions.

Paris and Berlin, thanks to the air traffic, are today neighboring cities, as they were in ancient times Athens and Thebes or in the Renaissance, Bologna and Ferrara. Despite of his planetary extension, the British Empire has barely the extension of the Roman Empire, and the Indian Ocean is barely greater than the Mediterranean.

Because of this constant reduction of the subjective distances, countries become smaller and the peoples got closer to each other.

Political technique

In case that the *political technique* is not able to adapt itself to this evolution of the *communications technique*, will appear a tension with terrible consequences. From the temporal and spatial approach of the neighboring peoples it must born a political approach, if it is desired to avoid fights between them.

It is not coincidence that the most advanced continent from of the point of view of the technique, *America*, is also the first to introduce the new method of relationship between States: the system of pacific association of the States that led to the Pan-American Union and the idea of the League of Nations.

In fact, the individual State, as developed through history, has become smaller to be independent soon: it must be reformed and expanded within a *Federation* of States.

The world ruling powers are currently federations: Russia, England, America.

The *Pan-American Federation* that is in the process of formation distinguishes from past federations in the sense that is not directed against another State system, but just against war and common cultural progress.

Europe must follow this example. Must complete her modern technique of the channels of communications with a modern technique of State organization. Otherwise, will be in danger of entering blindly into another war and perish drowned in a sea of toxic bombs.

3. World powers instead of big powers

Synthetic and analytical politics

The old system of great powers had to give way to a new system of world powers. Between the State and humanity have been introduced a third system: *the grouping of States*.

The attempt by Wilson to constitute an ecumenical league of nations failed, but in its place appeared or are appearing different leagues of nations.

The *Russian Empire* has become in a league of nations that reunite Russians, Byelorussians, Ukrainians, Kurds, Georgians, Circassians, Tartars and Armenians.

The *British Empire* is a league of nations that reunites Anglo-Saxons, Irish, French Canadians, Dutch Boers, Arabs, Hindus, Egyptians [1] and Malaysians.

Pan-America is evolving to a league of nations composed of Anglo-Americans, Spaniards, Portuguese, Indians, Blacks and Mestizos.

Finally, the *China Republic* is also a league of nations that reunites the Chinese of the north and south, Tibetans, Mongols, Manchurians and Turkomans.

Whereas outside the European world the synthetic tendency is stronger than the analytical and the smaller States tend to get closer to the world powers, in *Europe* is being developing an opposite process. Here the desire of freedom is stronger than the desire of organization; here, even the smallest nation wants to have a complete sovereignty without considering if she can survive or affront the competition. Whereas in the big countries the integration process is moving forward, Europe moves daily to the atomization. Austria-Hungary, West Russia and European Turkey have divided into many small States. Scandinavia has constituted two kingdoms.

[1] Despite of his formal autonomy, Egypt is a member of the British Empire

In Germany there are also two strong sides that aspire to a division of the Empire into small States. And nobody can tell when will stop this analytical tendency of the European politics.

The European peace agreement has only considered the analytical tendencies of the European peoples, not their synthetical needs. Currently there is in Europe fewer great powers, but more small States than before the war. The peace agreement has not achieved his second big mission: reunite the liberated nations. His destructive force was greater than his constructive force.

If the liberation of the European peoples is not completed with his union, the European States will be soon devoured by the world powers that are in full growth.

In the same way that England, America and Russia, Europe must find a balance between freedom and organization. This balance must lead, in the interior, to an *autonomy* the most expanded as possible and, in the exterior, to a *federation* the most extended as possible. England and America have already gone through these two stages. Thanks to that, England has preserved his kingdom and power, and Russia, that after the revolution appeared to be near a disintegration, has saved, thanks to this double method of autonomy and federation, the most part of her peoples.

Europe must understand that differentiation without integration leads to ruin and must complete her analytical policy with a synthetical policy.

The fields of international powers

The world political management currently takes place in *Washington, London, Moscow, Tokyo and Paris*. There is found the international fields of power. With this, we have already indicated the profiles of the future world powers.

The fifth planetary fields of power are:

The American,

The British,

The Russian,

The Far East,

The European.

A simple look to the map of the world show us the new division and structure of the Earth.

1. PAN-AMERICA: The Empire comprised by the Atlantic Ocean and Pacific Ocean, which political community is promoted by the Pan-American movement.

The second big geographical complex constituted by the ancient world (Australia included): Europe, Asia, Africa, Australia. This second complex is divided, according to the four cardinal points and the four big seas that surrounds it, the *four empires*. The Empire of the South, of the North, of the East and of the West.

2. THE EMPIRE OF THE SOUTH, situated near the Indian Ocean, is the core of the British Empire. Comprises East Africa, the Arab and Hindu worlds and Australia (The Cape, Suez, Calcutta, Singapore, Sydney). Limits north with the Mediterranean and the Himalayas.
3. THE EMPIRE OF THE NORTH, situated near the Artic Glacial Ocean, corresponds to the Russian Empire. Limits

west with Europe, south with the British world [2] and east with the Far East.

4. THE EMPIRES OF THE EAST, extended through the coasts of the Ocean Pacific, comprising China and Japan, countries that although politically separated from each other, are united by the community of the race, the language and the civilization.

5. THE WESTERN STATES, facing the Atlantic Ocean, they form Europe. This group of States is formed, on one side, by the European continent and his African colonies and, on the other side, separated by the Mediterranean. Comprises the continental Europe, from the North Cape to Morea, and the half of the continental Africa, from Tripoli and Morocco to the Congo and Angola. The Western States are not united, without organization, in perpetual fight with each other and dismembered by hate and jealousy.

From these five world complexes, none has a past richer than Europe, but none of them faces an uncertain future like Europe.

[2] Persia and Afghanistan are buffer States between the British Empire and Russia.

4. The situation of Europe in the world

The union of Europe

As a political concept, Europe does not exist. The part of the world that has this name constitutes a chaos of peoples and States, a source of international conflicts and future world wars.

The European question and the hate of some Europeans for other Europeans infects the international atmosphere and worries constantly even to the most pacific countries of the world. For this reason, the European question is not just a local problem but an international one. While it remains unresolved, is not possible to think in a pacific evolution of the world. Currently the European question has for the world almost the same importance that for a century had for Europe the Balkans question: a source of eternal insecurity and worries.

The *European question* will be resolved only through the *union of the peoples* of Europe. This union will be either, voluntarily by forming a *Pan-European Federation*, or forced with the conquest of Europe by Russia.

The European question will be resolved by Europe or by Russia, but will never be possible, for long time, the survival of this big number of European small States alongside the four world Empire of the future: the British, the Russian, the American and the Far Eastern.

The world hegemony of Europe is lost definitively, but remains her independence, her colonial Empire, her culture, her future.

Europe still can, by uniting in time, participate as a fifth factor with the same rights in the distribution of the world. But if remains divided, her political influence will decrease necessarily, until one day, after losing her colonies, falls, victim of the Russian invasion, in bankruptcy and in misery and debt.

Germany and Europe

The current situation of Europe resembles the situation of Germany at the beginning of the modern times.

Germany had at that time, as heir of the Roman Empire of the West, hegemony over the Cristian States of Europe. But was debilitated and impotent facing the rivalries of her princes.

Whereas the Sacred Roman German Empire was dissolving because of the independence aspirations of his cities and countries, was emerging in other parts of Europe nations with a strong centralized power: France, England, Spain and Sweden.

These nations, thanks to their homogeneity, became rapidly more powerful that the German Empire. In the Southeast was constituted the *hereditary monarchy of the Habsburgs*, a semi-Germanic monarchy which interests increasingly fall apart from Germany, as the Habsburgs extend their Empire to the East to the coast of Turkey. To the Northwest, the most advanced part of Germany, *Netherlands*, separated from the Empire to become, thanks to her colonial conquests, in a great independent power. Equally, England emancipate herself from the disorganized Europe to become in a great independent intercontinental power.

In times of Wallenstein, a united Germany could have repelled any foreign invasion and become the great power directing Europe. But the *Thirty Years war* was her deadly blow. With this war started the *second chapter* of the German decadence.

The great nations to the North and West of Germany take advantage of the German internal wars to accomplish their imperialist objectives. Hence, for centuries, Germany became the *battlefield of Europe*. Danish, Swedish, French and Spaniard armies, acting as allies of the German princes, devasted the German Empire. From the great distribution of colonies between the West and the East, Germany finished empty handed: while the other people became increasingly richer, Germany became increasingly poorer. With her wellbeing also disappeared her culture.

The cost that the German small States payed for their independence was high becoming in chess pieces for the European politics. England and France resolved their colonial differences with German soldiers in German ground.

Even the clash of the French Revolution was not able to unite the German princes. Their rivalry was stronger than their solidarity. Napoleon appeared, founded the Rhine Confederation, and this was the end for the Sacred Roman German Empire.

The *World War* signified for Europe the beginning of a new era, similarly to the Thirty Years war was for Germany. Europe, that not long ago still dominated the world, split in two fields. On the European ground fought Blacks, Hindus, Turks and Kurds. Europe became the *battlefield of Europe*. Her richer regions were devastated, the *flower* of her population massacred, the morality crumbled and everywhere grew the hate and jealousy.

The decadence of Europe

If Europe does not learn from history, will have the same fate that the Roman German Empire. Politically and militarily, Europe will become in the chess board of the world, object of the world politics, when one day was the subject of the same. She will not be considered in the distribution of the markets and of the producer countries of essential goods. The world powers of Russia and Great Britain will force that French and German soldiers fight each other along the Rhine in order to resolve their conflicting interests in Asia. As occurred yesterday with China and Turkey, will happen tomorrow with Europe. England, Russia and America will divide her in different zones of influence.

Whereas the other parts of the world, with their policies of collaboration, become increasingly richer, powerful and civilized, Europe is becoming poorer, weaker and falling in barbarism. The inter-European customs barriers will avoid a big economy, and the arms race and conflicts will end the rest of the European wellbeing.

In world politics, the European national politician will be soon so ridiculous as one day was the bell tower politician. The pettiness and the resentment spirit of the European politics will be the laugh of the world. Until finally to the Russian Revolution succeeds a Russian Napoleon that constitutes with the small States of Eastern Europe her Rhine Confederation and, by using this Confederation, give Europe the deadly blow.

There would be still time to save Europe of this fatal fate. The salvation is called *Pan-Europa*: the political and economic union of all European States, from Poland to Portugal, in a confederation of States.

II. European borders

The concept of Europe appeared from a mixture of geographical, political and cultural elements.

1. The decline of European world hegemony

The European peninsula

From the geographical point of view, the European continent does not exist. Only exists a European peninsula of the Eurasian continent. This peninsula is strangled by the Black Sea and by the Baltic Sea. To the North of the European peninsula is found the Scandinavian peninsula, the British and Icelandic archipelago.

Equally the western ridge of the Eurasian continent is called Europe, her Southeastern ridge is called *India*. India would have the same right as Europe to call herself continent, because has no less extension and no less population than Europe. Has a history and culture that distinguishes her from the rest of Asia. Even more, the Himalayas es a natural geographical border between India and Asia, whereas the Ural constitutes an arbitrary border between Europe and Asia.

Today the sea is considered as a Europe geographical border: on one side, from the Atlantic Ocean to the Mediterranean and the Black Sea and, on the other side to the Artic Glacial Ocean. Only to the East Europe lacks natural limits, part from where Europe starts becoming, slowly, in Asia. Neither mountains nor rivers separate the European peninsula from Asia. For that reason and to justify geographically the existence of Europe, the geographers needed to recognize as European border the only mountain range that goes from North to South and that cuts the Eurasian plains, the *Ural Mountains*, despite that these not delimit the European peninsula but they are in the middle of the Asian continent.

The Ural Mountains were recognized also as European border because since two centuries ago constitute the political border of the Russian homeland.

Geography, politics, civilization

The concept of Europe appeared from a mixture of geographical, political and cultural elements. The Northern, Southern and Western borders of the European continent were fixed by the geography; the Eastern border, by politics. Thus, the Eastern border of Europe changed constantly: from the Rhine to the Urals, from the Adriatic to the Caspian Sea. The geographical concept of Europe not corresponds with the cultural concept nor with the political concept of Europe: from the cultural point of view, Australia forms part of Europe, and, from the geographical point of view, Great Britain constitutes a part of Europe, whereas politically both are outside of Europe and belongs to the intercontinental British Empire.

We need to clearly distinguish the division of the world according to *continents, empires or world cultures.*

GEOGRAPHICALLY, the world is divided in five continents: Eurasia, Africa, Australia, North America and South America.

POLITCALLY, the world is divided in five fields of power: the American, the European, the Far East, the Russian and the British.

CULTURALLY, we can identify in the world four great cultural circles: the European, the Chinese, the Hindu and the Arab.

We need to take in consideration this division, to avoid, in respect to Europe, deplorable confusions.

2. Historical borders of Europe

The Stages of the European evolution

Hellas was the first Europe. Her conflict with Persia generated the tension between Europe and Asia, generated the European idea. The border of this Europe was constituted by the Mediterranean and the Aegean, the Sea of Marmara and the Black Sea, the Bosporus and the Dardanelles. Neither the Greeks not the Romans were worried to know where was the European Easter border that went to the North of the Black Sea.

Alexander the Great, who was semi-Helene, eliminated the Eastern border between Europe and Asia and founded the first Eurasian Empire, which culture was the Hellenism.

Rome created the second Europe. This Europe comprised the Mediterranean neighboring countries. The Rhine and the Danube constituted the Northeastern border of Roman Europe. This border, from the cultural point of view, never disappeared to this day.

The division of the Roman Empire separated the Balkans from Europe and moved the gravity center of the Empire to Western Europe. The Roman Empire of the East became an intermediary Empire between Europe and the East, a Eurasian Empire. Europe became Roman Catholic, Western Asia Muslim, whereas Byzantium and Russia became Greek Orthodox and remained for centuries without a decisive influence of the fate of Europe.

The great invasions created the third Europe. The Germanic kingdoms raised from the ruins of the Western Empire. This Germanic Europe, that reached her peak with *Charlemagne*, limited to the West with the Moorish Spain, to the East with the Slavs, Avars and Byzantines. At that time, the Elba constituted the Eastern border of Europe.

After the fall of the Carolingian Empire, the Papacy was slowly taking care of the direction of Europe. Hence, appeared the *fourth Europe*, which borders increased with the extension of the Roman

Catholic faith. This four Europe extended to the East to Lithuania, Poland and Hungary and the Crusades took part as a political union against the Mahometan Asia. Reached her peak with *Innocent III*, that imposed also his political supremacy over the kings of Europe.

The Europe of the Popes sank definitively with the Reform, that divide Europe in two parts: a Protestant North and a Catholic South.

The Enlightenment, which ideas put in a second place the religious conflicts, created the base for a *fifth Europe*: the Europe of the *Enlightened Absolutism*. To this Europe adhered Russia in the times of Peter the Great, a country that during the Mongol domination formed part of Asia. Thus, the Urals constituted the Eastern European border, that reached his bigger extension.

The peak of the fifth Europe was represented by *Napoleon*, who was the last to reconstitute the European Empire of Julius Cesar, Charlemagne and Innocent III. Would have won in Leipzig, it would be today a United States of Europe, under either a Bonapartist regime or under a Republic. His fall led Europe to an international chaos. But the idea of a united Europe that he revived never died, remained alive within the circles of reactionaries and revolutionaries, among the kings and among the peoples.

The idea of European solidarity inspired the *Saint Alliance* and the dreams of Mazzini as well in relation to a united and republican Europe. The fights between the principles of Metternich and of Mazzini filled the interior politics of the past century. *The World War* was the judge that decided over these differences: Mazzini won over Metternich, the thrones of Central and Eastern Europe fell, the oppressed nations reached their freedom, to Europe came the Democracy and, and with this, the clear way for the constitution of a *sixth Europe: the one of the United States of Europe*, the Pan-European Federation.

This internal political balance of the European States coincides in time with the separation of England and Russia from Europe. The transformation of Great Britain in an oceanic federation brought to first plane his extra-European interests. At the same time, Russia, with the proclamation of the Soviet system, separated from the European

democratic system. Again, the Eastern border is moved from our continent from the Urals and the Caucasus, to the line that separates the Soviet system from the European democracies. This line coincides roughly with the geographical limits of the European peninsula.

The future of the European borders

The Urals will never be again the border from Europe and Asia. Possibly someday, Russia could reunite again with Europe, but at that moment not the Urals but the Altai Mountains will constitute the border between Europe and Asia, and thus Europe would limit with the Chinese and Japanese Empires as with the Pacific Ocean.

Is also probable that Russia advances to the West to form with the Germans and the Western Slavs a counterbalance to the Anglo-Saxon and Western European powers: in this case, Europe, as in Roman times, would have the Rhine and the Alps for a border, until the mentioned border will also be erased by the new barbarian invasion.

Now, the Balkans are the only limits of Europe with Asia. To the North, between Asia and Europe is formed a new Eurasian Empire, that separates Europe from Asia, similarly that at one time did the Seleucid and Byzantine Empires.

Again, is the politics that decides the Eastern border of Europe: to the East, the limits of this sixth Europe coincide with the ones of the democratic system.

3. European civilization

The European civilization

The *European civilization* comprises, outside the geographical limits of Europe, all the *American, Australian, South-African and New Zealand* continent. In addition, in all the colonies are oasis of the European civilization.

The European civilization is the civilization of the *white race* and has his roots in the ancient times and Christianity. Thus, the European civilization receives also the name of *Christian*, in juxtaposition with the Islamic, Buddhist, Hinduist and Confucian civilization of Asia.

The two polarities of the European civilization are the Hellenic *individualism* and the Christian *socialism*.

The European civilization is by nature *pragmatic and rationalist*, aspires to achieve with all its strength reasonable objectives. Its best contribution is the science and the practical application of this technique, to chemistry and to medicine. In this, it advantages by far to all the rest of civilizations that existed until now.

Thanks to its strong activity, because of its Nordic character, the European civilization dominates around the entire world, thus, whereas the other civilizations are in decadence, the European advances triumphant. Towards it, is facing the most distant Empire of the East, the Japan, which example followed China, Siam, Afghanistan, Persia, Turkey and Egypt. Seemingly, in a century the European civilization will absorb all the rest.

The division of the European civilization

The Christian-European civilization is divided in different branches, in which it could be seen the beginning of new civilizations.

One of these branches of the European civilization is the *Americanism*. Represent the opposite extreme to all orientalism, of

contemplation and mysticism. It is optimist, ambitious, energic and progressist. In addition, this Americanism is not only present in America, but it reigns also in the industrial centers of the old world (Berlin).

Another ramification of the European civilization is, apparently, the Russian. But there are numerous signs that indicates that Russia is the starting point of a new civilization that will unite Asiatic and European elements under a new synthesis.

From the ethnographical point of view, Russia is a mixture of European and Mongols elements (Tartars and Finnish). Since the times of the great invasions, politically and culturally Russia belongs at some point of time to Europe and another to Asia. Her last Asiatic era, the Tartar domination lasted from 1200 until 1498. During this time, adopted external forms of European civilization, but without becoming Europeanized in the interior.

The *Bolshevism* shook the European civilization that Peter the Great and his successors imported, expelling and killing the vast number of representatives of this civilization. Moves away of the Christian and democratic Europe and, with European theories and Asiatic practices, tries to set the foundations for a new civilization.

Future will tell if the cultural emancipation from Europe of Russia becomes a reality as prophesized by Spengler. Because it also could happen that Russia, after a pause, continues with her interrupted Europeanization and extends the zone of the European civilization to the Pacific Ocean.

But while it remains uncertain the cultural future of Russia, the political border of Eastern Europe that limits with Russia represents also the Eastern border of the cultural community of Europe.

Russia and Japan are the two exponents of the *Euro-Asiatic* civilizations. Maybe someday they will achieve a higher-level synthesis.

4. Pan-Europa

The limits of Pan-Europa

Europe, as a political concept, contains *all democratic States (and semi-democratic) of continental Europe*, including Iceland, which is united to Denmark through a personal union. The part of the European Turkey belongs politically to Asia.

To the political concept of Europe, to distinguish from the geographical concept, I call it Pan-Europa.

I realize that not everyone will accept this name. It will be objected that a Europe without England and Russia cannot be called *Pan-Europa*, the entire Europe. In theory, this objection is justified, but has no practical meaning. The Pan-American Union also excludes Canada and the European colonies in America. Neither the Pan-Hellenic movement of Demosthenes contained all the States of Greece. I chose the term Pan-Europa to express the analogy with the *Pan-Americanism* and with the *Pan-Hellenism*.

The Relative extension of Pan-Europa

Pan-Europa is formed by twenty-six great States and seven small territories. The extension of this group of States is about 5 million square kilometers and its population number is about 300 million.

But this numbers are incomplete, because the European regions of the Pan-European group of States constitutes only a part of his power. In order to correctly appreciate the future possibilities of Pan-Europa, it must be considered also his colonies.

The colonies of Pan-Europa are divided in two groups:

1. *The African colonial Empire* (Libya, French Africa, Angola, Congo) with 16 million of square kilometers and 53 million of inhabitants.
2. *The other colonies over the rest of the world* (Mozambique, Madagascar, Dutch Indies, French Indochina,

Guyana, etc.) with 5 million of square kilometers and 78 million of inhabitants.

Therefore, Pan-Europa contains, including the colonies, a surface of approximately 26 million of square kilometers and 431 million of inhabitants. The next table allow us to compare with the other groups and world powers:

		Millions	
	Inhabitants		Km^2
Pan-Europa	431		26
Europa	431		26
British Empire	454		36
Russian Empire	145		22
Mongol Empire	408		12
Pan-America	212		30

This comparison shows the necessity that Europe has, for reasons of world politics, to achieve a union. Whereas in the long run each of every European State by themselves would be prisoners of the great powers, either politically as economically, Pan-Europa, with her union, could be one of the greatest powers, maybe the strongest. Because of her population she is in the second place, because of her surface in the third place. Would be strong enough to repel victoriously any military invasion and any other economic competition.

With a singular organization and a rational exploitation of her African colonial Empire, which extension is like the eastern part of Russia, Pan-Europa could produce by herself all the food and essential goods needed and, like this, obtain her economic independence.

Thanks to her centric situation between England and America, on one side, and between Russia and Orient, on the other side, and thanks to the tradition and the capabilities of her inhabitants, this united Europe would be called to be, for a long time, the cultural center of the world and would have the enough capacity to achieve it.

III. Europe and England

Every Pan-European must realize that the Union of Europe is not directed against England.

1. Small or big Europe?

A previous question

The idea of a *United States of Europe* is already old. Today also many Europeans look in it the wanted ideal, the only salvation against the chaos of the present, the only salvation against the crumbling of the future.

But this ideal remained inactive; it was nothing more than a literary problem, it never became a political program; to many it was a dream, but an objective just for a few. Many plays with this idea, but almost none moves a finger to make it a reality.

If a radical change cannot be produced to face the European idea, the United States of Europe will continue to be an eternal ideal that will never be in touch with the political reality.

One of the main causes of this curious *lack of reality of the European thinking* is the disagreement that reigns within the European borders. The disagreement manifests itself with this *previous subject about Europe: "Do Russia and England belong, or just one of them, or none, to the future United States of Europe?"*

This question has multiple answers, and, for this reason, is impossible to achieve any Pan-European action. Many followers of the idea of a European Federation cannot imagine a Europe without England, and others without Russia. For this reason, neither the politicians, neither the European governments dare to answer this *question*.

Since Russia, by breaking with the democratic system, has situated outside of Europe, the subject is much easier, because a narrow federation between a Soviet power and a democratic States is almost unachievable.

Therefore, *before* taking the first steps towards the creation of Pan-Europa, Europe must resolve only the *English previous question*.

The small Germany and the great Germany

The difficulty of the English problem resides in, on one side, Great Britain and Ireland belong without any doubt to the geographical concept of Europe, whereas, on the other side, results impossible to consider the British Empire as a European State. In addition, the English civilization is a fundamental factor of the European civilization.

The current relationship of England with Europe is analogous to the *Austrian relationship with the Germanic Confederation* of the mid XIX century. While the Austrian countries of the Alpes formed a part, without any doubt, of the German union, the entire Austrian Empire was not a German State, although it was governed from Vienna.

In 1848 the German union could not be achieved, despite that the entire public opinion of the nation wished it, because there were two opposite programs that separated the spirits: the program of the *great Germany* of Schwarzenberg and the program of the *small Germany* of Bismarck.

The followers of the program of the *great Germany* highlighted the enormous power that Germany would obtain by uniting to the Great Austria and that it was unbearable that the Austrians Germans continue to be separated.

On the contrary, the followers of the *small Germany* defended the idea that it was preferable a smaller Germany, but united, than a bigger Germany, but divided by reasons of nationality, and that Austria, in big political decisions, would sacrifice the interests of Germany in favor of the interests of her own monarchy.

In 1866, Bismarck achieved finally his program of the small Germany, respecting Austria to the maximum, but he next complete it with an intimate alliance with Austria, thus uniting the advantages of both programs.

This political act of Bismarck must serve as example for the solution of the European question. Equally, that time ago the spirits were divided with respect to the question of the inclusion or exclusion of Austria, they are also in the present divided with respect to the *inclusion or exclusion of the British Empire.*

The same that before the two programs of the small Germany and great Germany were confronted against themselves, equally today the two programs of the small and great Europe are confronted with each other.

The small Europe instead of and the great Europe

The followers of the great Europe cannot even imagine a United States of Europe without England. They want that the British Empire to be one of the States of the European Federation. With this policy, Pan-Europa would obtain power but would lose cohesion, because a Europe to which belongs Australia, Canada and South Africa would not be Europe anymore, but an intercontinental Europe. The bigger and richer members of this European Union would be geographically outside Europe, that would be involved, because of them, in every international conflict.

The Great Europe will be divided in two heterogenous parts: the English-speaking countries, on one side, that, spread all over the world, form part of the British Empire; and on the other side, the compact set of European States that are not English.

The constant tension between the two groups, which interests are opposed in many aspects, would paralyze the Great Europe in terms of her possibilities of political action in the international context, until finally a rupture is created.

Theoretically, we can conceive the Great Europe in another fashion: Great Britain and Ireland will unite with Pan-Europe, but not their colonies or domains.

This solution is not achievable in practice, because would signify the dissolution of the British Empire. Canada would follow in little time the English example and would enter in the Pan-American Union. This would be the end of the British union, because a country could not belong at the same time to two world Empires. It is necessary to decide for one or another.

This solution would not be also a blessing for Europe. Europe would end to encounter herself in the same situation than the German Confederation when the kings of Holland, England and Denmark were German confederated princes. The German Confederation lost all his action capability because of his members, that looked at more for the interests of their kingdoms that for the interests of Germany. In the same way, England, as a confederate State, would sacrifice always the interest of Europe for the interests of the British Empire.

The union of England and Ireland with Pan-Europa would be possible after the fall of the British Empire. If one day Canada and Australia unite with America and if India and South Africa announce their independence, would always remain to the English motherland the possibility to enter the Pan-European federation, the same way that, after the fall of the Habsburgs, the German Empire looked gladly that the German Austria decided to unite with him.

But it is not completely true that, even in this case, England would want to unite with Pan-Europa, because, if on one side is geographically and historically united with Europe, language, blood and cultural ties unite her with North America. It would be possible that these latter ties will result stronger and that England will try to unite before with the other side of the ocean than with the other side of the English Channel.

But while the British Empire remains big and powerful, this program stays still distant. Thus, the only practical program that remains for Europe is the *Small Europe solution*.

The program of the Small Europe results from the reality that the British Empire is an *extra-European empire*, equally that the monarchy of the Habsburgs was not a German Empire.

Great Britain as an intercontinental empire

The British Empire is a *great power spread over the five continents*: in Europe, England; in Asia, India; in Africa, South Africa; in Oceania, Australia; in America, Canada.

Politically, Great Britain is already a continent, that is not European, nor Asiatic, nor African, nor Australian, nor American, but simply British. They are not the geographic ties that maintain unite this continent but the common language, the culture of dominant nation and the political wisdom of their chiefs.

Results impossible to *integrate* this continent into a European federation, that surpass Pan-Europa in surface and in population, but maybe it will be possible someway to unite it with Europe, as Bismarck also united the foreign policy of Germany with the monarchy of the Habsburgs.

Pan-Europa must be constituted *without* England, but *not against* England; similarly, Pan-Europa has been organized without Canada, but not against Canada. Pan-America also has decided for the *Small America* solution, excluding Canada, despite that Canada is the biggest country of America and geographically is more united with America than England with Europe. The American republics realized since the first moment that Canada could not participate at the same time to the British group and to the American group.

Pan-Europa must follow the example of Pan-America and decide without hesitation for the program of the Small Europe. But, at the same time, the friendship between Canada and the American republics must answer with a cordial understanding between England and the European States.

England, that is united with both Europe and America by economic, cultural and historical ties, is called to be the intermediary between these two continents, without belonging politically to one or the other.

2. Pan-Europa and England

England and the peace

It would be a big and unrepairable mistake from the Pan-European movement create a confronting situation with England or be manipulated against the British interests.

Pan-Europa, since the first moments of her constitution, must play a fair game (*fair play*) with England. Every Pan-European must understand that the union of Europe is *not directed against England* but, on the contrary, has the objective of becoming, along with England, one of the columns of world peace and one of the stages of the world organization.

Today and in a near future, the policy of England can be only pacific, because the British Empire is over saturated and need the decades to digest all that was ingested. In a future war, whichever will be, England can lose everything, without any possibility to win anything important.

Europe also needs with urgency peace whereas Russia and Japan, in the case of winning a war, could gain a lot (Constantinople, the hot seas, India, China, Philippines and Australia), Europe in the face of any war risks of losing everything. On the contrary, Europe, even in the case of victory, would not gain anything important.

Therefore, England and Europe are aligned in relation with the *policy of peace.* As soon as England receives *real guarantees and of principle* that the Pan-European federation is not directed against England and that her objectives are pacific, will be politically interested to encourage her constitution, whereas, in the case of the reverse, England will do everything possible to bring to failure this federation.

One of the objectives of the English policy that has been pursuing more constantly since some centuries ago is to contribute to the failure of the continental union under the hegemony of a great power. This idea originated the battles against Philip II, Louis XIV, Napoleon I, Nicholas I and William II, because the union of the continent under the

direction of a dominator or of a warrior people signified the eternal threat of England. Today also, England would remain faithful to her traditional policy and would fight against all hegemony of Europe.

To Pan-Europa, the situation is another. The Pan-European Union would not have an offensive character, similarly to the Pan-American Union; her structure would be *democratic*, thus against all hegemony, and her objective is *pacifist*. This political constellation would bring to England the advantage of a lasting peace in Europe, peace that could not be seized in another way. This advantage would be of capital importance for England, because in a future war between the great European powers England could not remain neutral. It is also in favor of the interests of England that the European economy could be stabilized and that she can have Europe as a client with purchase power and trustful.

Additionally, England is also interested to prevent that the world power of Russia reaches the coasts of the North Sea.

But if the Pan-European Union could not be constituted, the German-Russian union will be just a matter of time. Thus, Russia would menace directly not only India but also the British Isles. However, is vital for the future of England that the coasts of the North Sea will belong to a friendly power: therefore, must prefer the Pan-European neighborhood to the Russian neighborhood.

The security of England

All these arguments, however, will only have merit if Pan-Europa *guarantees the security of England*. Indeed, since the invention of the plane and the submarine the situation of England is quite complicated; her insular character, that before was an advantage, has become in a disadvantage. Currently, any relatively important submarine fleet could provoke the hunger of England, and the English Channel is no longer an obstacle for the planes could destroy London. In theory, not only France, but also Belgium and Holland would be in condition to destroy London and to hunger to death England.

Therefore, the British policy must be restructured totally. England cannot protect herself militarily anymore against an attack from Europe. She can only protect herself *politically*. The only policy that can guarantee the security of England is the creation in Europe of a pacific system of friendly States that could constitute a neutral zone, a buffer State of big dimensions, so to speak, face to Russia, that could prevent the progression of the latter reaching British waters.

The interest of Europe for England

The situation of Pan-Europa facing England is not the same that England facing Pan-Europa. Whereas Pan-Europa could menace the existence of England, she could not give Europe a mortal blow, could not impose a blockage to Europe and make her die of hunger, because if Europe is in peace with Russia, she could receive food from her. But even in the case that Russia could unite to the blockage, Europe could maintain her connection with the reserves of prime materials that is Africa, through or under the Gibraltar strait (through a tunnel or submarines).

However, Europe is interested to conserve the friendship with England and that she approves the Pan-European union, because England could difficult greatly the constitution of Pan-Europa, because of the dominant influence that exercises over many European States (Portugal, Norway, Greece, etc.). In addition, Europe, despite of her overpopulation, has not the disponible of *settlement colonies*, whereas Great Britain has plenty of settlement zones. Both parts are, therefore, interested to direct a part of the migration flow of Europe to Australia, Canada and South Africa. Closing these regions to Europeans would suppose a serious blow for Europe. On the other side, England is also interested that the population of her domains increases rapidly, in order to defend themselves in case of war, since that for technical reasons, the fleet can no longer offer the protection of the past.

Currently there are three *regions of overpopulation*: Pan-Europa, Eastern Asia and India. As the overpopulation of England not covers the immigration needs of her colonies, her national interest demands that the Europeans instead of the Hindus, the Japanese or Chinese,

are the ones to populate her regions less populated, because a German, a Polish or an Italian could feel Anglo-Australian within one or two generations, whereas a Chinese, never.

The interests of England and of Pan-Europa are entwined to the point that a war or simple enmity between them could be harmful for both parts. They must in the future *divide* themselves in the *cultural mission of Europe*: whereas the British Empire is in charge of the extensive mission, make the world European with her conquests, Pan-Europa has to be responsible of the intensive mission: develop to the maximum the European culture via the collaboration of all her nations.

3. Anglo-European entente

Anglo-European accord

The agreement of England with the Pan-European union will only be achieved through an accord that *guarantee the security of England against a European attack.*

The main points of this accord would be the following:

1. *Binding mediation treaty* between Pan-Europa and Great Britain.
2. Disarmament of the European *submarine fleet*.
3. Accord about the *air fleet* of the future, that corresponds to the Washington agreement and prevents England against any air attack.
4. *Colonial concentration in Africa*, via the exchange of the Western African English colonies with equivalent European colonial regions of Eastern Africa.
5. England in charge of the *protection of the European colonies in Asia* (French and Holland Indies) against any attack from a third country. Europe, at her place, commits to repel any attack to the English motherland (e.g. an air attack from Russia to London).
6. The British domains are committed to grant to the *European immigrants* the same rights that English people has.

As point seven of the accord it could be established, in addition, that during the first years of the Pan-European federation will concede England the mediation of all conflicts between the members of this federation.

This accord will constitute a great advantage for both parts. Without questioning the independence of the two empires, could increase the security of both parts, the exclusion of any war between England and Europe and open the way for an international collaboration at the service of the world peace. England would be liberated of the

phantom of an invasion, and Europe could leave without protection her colonial borders with British Africa.

This accord would be more advantageous than an alliance, because would allow Europe to remain neutral in a possible war cause of India and the Pacific Ocean, whereas, on the other side, England could remain neutral in a war conflict between Russia and Europe.

This accord could be extended later, with the pertinent modifications, to America, the Extreme Orient and to Russia and thus secure, long-term, the world peace.

IV. Europe and Russia

The principal objective of the European policy must be to prevent the Russian invasion. To prevent it, there is only one way: The European Union.

1. Hellas as a warning

Pan-Hellenism

In many aspects, the modern Europe is politically like the ancient Hellas. The Doric, Ionic and Eolic peoples populated the half of Southern Balkans and the isles and neighboring coasts and organized in sovereign States and group of States, jealous of their independence and distrustful and envious of each other.

Although politically divided, they had however the sentiment of being part of a *cultural community* and, as such, they felt superiors to the other peoples. They were united by the same religion, the same historical-mythical tradition, a common national epic, the Olympic games, the Amphictyony [3] and the mysteries.

[3] Confederations of the ancient Greek cities.

This people, intellectually gifted, was politically blind. Their three great powers, Sparta, Athena and Thebes, instead of uniting with each other, they constantly compete to see which of them had the hegemony, both in times of peace and in times of war. The big Medic wars gave place to a momentary understanding. But, as soon as the Persian danger disappeared, began again the old rivalries.

The crucial point of this fight constituted the *Peloponnesian war*, that was the war that decided the Greek hegemony between Sparta and Athens. This war, in which participated all Greek States and both

parts showed an exasperation and cruelty never showed before, it crumbled the Greek civilization and ruined her economy. In all senses, the Peloponnesian war was the precursor of the World War.

After the defeat, the humiliation and disarmament of his eternal Athenian enemy, the victorious Spartans could not enjoy for long time their hegemony, conquered with an elevated price. Athens was soon liberated by Thrasybulus, and the hegemony of Greece went to the hands of Thebes, thanks to the political and military genius of Epaminondas and of Pelopidas [4].

But the triumph of Thebes was also of short duration, because while the Greek cities fought for the hegemony, it was consolidating in the north of Greece a new barbarian power: *Macedonia*. His king *Filippo*, that at his arrival to the throne found a new chaotic state, had adopted the Greek culture and Hellenized his people [5]. But, at the same time, with his political and military advances, constituted a menace for the independence of Greece.

[4] The similarity between the Greek policy in the times that goes from the Peloponnesian wars and the conquest by Macedonia and the current situation of Europe es extraordinary, comprises even the littlest details.

[5] The danger of a Macedonian invasion appeared then to the Greeks as paradoxical as it seems today to the most of Europeans the danger of a Russian invasion.

The Macedonian danger awakened, at the last moment, *the Pan-Hellenic movement*. A part of Greeks, under the guide of *Demosthenes*, recognized the danger that menaced them and looked in the *Federation* the only remedy. But not even the eloquence of Demosthenes could assure the Pan-Hellenism and the victory over the local nationalism. And the Pan-Hellenism failed cause of the meanness and myopia of the Greeks.

But not only were the agents of Filippo, like Aeschines, the opposers to the Pan-Hellenists, and other also, like the wise and noble Phocion, whose conviction was that Hellas, in her corruption and division, was already at the point of the political downfall and that only an invasion could regenerate her.

And the catastrophe arrived. Filippo forced primarily his admission in the Amphictyonic league. And this was the pretext to enter Greece.

At this last moment of maximum danger, Demosthenes could seal an alliance between the both sister republics, and enemies at the same time, of Thebes and Athens. Filippo won at Chaeronea and *ended forever with the freedom of Greece*. Thebes remained destroyed, Athens broken, and Sparta reduced to a small village and without influence.

The world history passed by Hellas for not listening to the call of the times.

2. The Russian danger

The Danger of a Russian invasion

The Macedonian of Europe is Russia. Whereas Europe is divided in twenty-six States and greater number of sovereignties, Russia constitutes a united political set which surface es four times and half bigger than of Pan-Europa and which number of inhabitants doubles the most populated nation of Europe.

Without counting the little border with Turkey, Russia is the only neighbor that Pan-Europa has by land. Face to an organized and industrialized Russia, no European State could do anything militarily. Russia, with her simple existence, is exercising a constant pressure over the European States. This pressure will increase, because the European *demographic rise* cannot follow the rhythm of the Russian.

The whole European question finishes in the Russian problem. The main objective of the European policy must be to prevent the Russian invasion. To prevent it, there is only one way: *the European union*.

The history puts Europe before two options: or find herself or, putting aside all the national hostilities, constitute a federation of States, or fall victim of the Russians claws. Europe has not a third option.

The march of Russia towards Occident

Since Peter the Great, Russia is in a *continuous march towards Occident*. The Baltic States, Poland and Finland constitute the stages of this march, march that stopped only when it arrived at the borders of the military monarchies of Center Europe of Prussia and Austria. These two monarchies constituted the dam that saved Europe of the Russian tide. In the war between Turkey and Russia, the latter tried to pass this dam through the south part. The peace of Saint Stefano, that moved forward the Russian border indirectly to the Aegean Sea, constitutes the most elevated point of the Russian advance. Suddenly, Europe realized of the Russian danger; realized that the Turkish danger disappeared and instead in its place appeared the Russian danger; for this reason, decidedly put herself on the side of Turkey against Russia, and the Berlin Congress forced Russia to give back the conquered lands.

Russia thus realized that her march towards Occident would be doomed to failure while the central Empires remain. For that reason, allied herself with the adversaries of them: France, the Balkans and Austria.

The World War annihilated the central Empires and, with this, fell the wall that separated Europe with Russia. In the place of the military monarchies of the center of Europe, we have now half a dozen of small and medium States and a disarmed great State. None of these States is strong enough as to resist, long-term, to the Russian pressure. Poland and Romany are too weak to represent in this century the role that represented in the past Prussia and Austria: the role of borders police facing Russia.

As soon as Russia recover from her internal catastrophe, nor Poland, nor Romany, nor Czechoslovakia will be able to stop the Russian march towards Occident; and much less the disarmed States of Hungary, Austria and Germany. The Russian world power will have then the open way to the Rhine, to the Alpes and to the Adriatic. But it is evident that this border would be provisional, just a stage, and Russia, after an armistice, would conquer Western Europe easily as

Central Europe. At this moment, it would be fulfilled the same destiny that one day was fulfilled in Greece.

World War and world revolution

The fact that Russia in the last ten years attempted *twice* to dominate Europe shows how close is the danger that menaces Europe. The first attempt was the World War; the second, the world revolution. If in 1915 the Czar Nicholas had conquered Berlin and Vienna, would be him that dictated the peace, and Europe would be at his feet. The Czech and Southern Slav reigns would had become then in vassals States of Russia and the half of Europe would be in the sphere of influence of Russia.

If in 1919 Liebknecht would had conquered in Germany, this country would had adhered to the confederation of peoples directed by Moscow and Italy and the Balkans would had followed her example, the same for Hungary, and Lenin would had become in the master of Europe.

Between 1915 and 1919 all changed radically in Russia, all but her desire for expansion. This desire is not united to a party or a personality. Front of it, had to incline both the Czar Nicholas, the Czar of peace, and the socialist Kerensky and the Bolshevists chiefs, that, however, they obtained the power under the sign of radical pacifism. The imperialism of the Czars served itself from the Pan-Slav propaganda; the Bolshevik imperialism, in Occident, lean on the third International and, in Orient, on the Pan-Islamic nationalism.

Equally than time ago the imperial army of the Czar Nicholas overnumbered all the European armies, the red army of Trotsky is now much bigger in number than any European army.

Russia does not hide her offensive intentions. Her chiefs declare that their supreme objective is the overturn of the European democracies and the inclusion of all the peoples in the Moscow league of nations. They laugh of the pacifist methods of the second International and predicate the red militarism.

The Bolshevism behaves in front the socialism the same way that the Islamism in front of Christianity. Fights with the propaganda on one hand and with the sword on the other; advocates for violence, terror, militarism. The Bolshevism is the masculine form of the Marxism, and Social-Democracy the feminine.

Europe must be conscious that for the Soviets the peace between the democratic States and the Soviet States is not more than armistice, a pause, to gain strength and prepare for the next attack, because the final and definitive objective of the Communists chiefs is still the world Communist revolution. Only in terms of the method of execution there exist differences of opinion between the Russian politicians, not in terms of the objective.

The red Russia, equally to the white Russia of the day, prepares a new barbarian invasion following the steps of Attila and Genghis Khan (Temujin).

Thanks only to the chance that the red army fell one year before the German and that the Russian chaos were even greater than the European, Europe is free. The destruction of the industries and the Russian trains stopped the march of Russia to Occident and even forced her back to Orient.

Red danger and White danger

It has begun a race between Russia and Europe to see which of both rise before from her ruins. Europe has more advantages, because her machinery and her trains network remained almost intact. On the contrary, Russia has the advantage of her political and economic union facing a Europe divided in a dozen of economic zones and in a bigger number of sovereign States. If Russia achieves to recover economically thanks to a couple of good harvests, before Europe can unite, the destiny of Europe would be the defeat, no matter what the government system of Russia could be. As soon as an opportunity of taking over Europe presents to Russia, she will not let it go, whether it is a red Russia or a white Russia.

The imperialists tendencies of the red Russia are evident. But is not less true that, with the occasion of a change of system in Russia, the Napoleon of Orient would try to substitute with fame and triumphs the rights that he stole to his people and compensate the internal weakness with a greater external power. This recipe is not new and almost always has been successful.

Everyone that has been worried to study the situation that reigns in the Communist Russia will know which destiny waits for Europe in the case of an invasion of the red Russia.

More difficult is to predict which would be the destiny of Europe in the case of an invasion of the white Russia. The comparison with the times of Napoleon is not useful, because whereas France was then the most cultivated country of Europe, Russia is currently the most uncultivated country of all. To have an approximated idea of the consequences of such invasion, it is needed to grab the reports about the invasion of Mesopotamia by the Tartar Napoleon. In this occasion, Timur killed, only in Bagdad, eight thousand men, with no distinction of age and sex, and destroyed the city, that was the center of a cultural world. In the current state of the technique, such events could be repeated in a future war much more easily than in the past wars. For that reason, the citizens of Berlin and Paris, of Vienna and Milano, must put at work their fantasies and take the needed precautions, before it is too late.

3. European guarantee pact

European solidarity

The common objective of all Europeans, with no distinction of party or nation, should be to prevent the Russian invasion.

The *red* Russia victory would signify not only the downfall of the European bourgeoisie but also, as the process against the leaders of the social revolution showed, the downfall of the European Social Democracy.

The *white* Russia victory would not favor any party or any social class. Among the European nations will be shared the destiny that had to endure for a century the Russian Poland. Not only the socialism, also liberalism would be stepped over, and Europe, in terms of her cultural policy, will go back to the times of Philip II.

As nobody can predict how the future Russia will be, it would not be very intelligent and irresponsible to play, for opportunistic reasons, with the hope of a Russian victory, because it could happen that for those who want a Russian Bela Kun [6] find themselves without expecting it with a Russian Horthy [7], who would answer his call to trample them with more strength.

[6] Hungarian politician (1866-1937) who, when returning to Hungary after the first World War, installed for some months a Soviet Communist republic.

[7] Hungarian politician (1868-1957) who, in 1919, as leader of the order party provoked the failure of the revolutionary movement of Bela Kun.

The only intelligent policy for Europe consists in create a peace policy with Russia, but with the backs cover against any eventuality. This guarantee can be sustained only if all European States are *warrant in solidarity of the Russian-European border*, if they constitute a *Pan-European alliance of defense* against the Russian danger.

This guarantee pact, already spoken about at the Conference of Genoa, could guarantee a long-term security of Europe against Russia. In fact, if Russia knows that an attack against Poland or Romania will produce the counterattack of the armies of France, Italy, Germany and Spain, she will think it twice and moreover if she knows that Germany will remain gladly neutral and that Poland would be only protected by the Small Entente and France.

This *Pan-European guarantee pact* would be an act of political wisdom and, at the same time, of justice, because a Russian attack against Warsaw, Lemberg or Bucharest will be also indirectly directed against Berlin, Vienna or Paris. France, Germany and Italy would be defending at Dniester not so much a foreign border but their own border.

From the part of Europe, would be not only unfair but also illogical demand that Poland and Romania to be responsible of the Europe defense against an empire that is thirty times bigger that both together. In the dace of the Russian armament growth, would be impossible for them to keep the pace. This arms race would ruin completely the economy of *Poland* and *Romania*, until one day they reach complete

exhaustion and their hands and feet tied under the mercy of Russia. Europe must get ahead of this evolution and protect her only border that is not marked by the sea, instead of leaving her defense in the hands of the relatively weak States.

The *second condition* for a good protection of the Eastern border is the union of the *European States*. The eternal familiar discussions between the European nations weaken the defensive potential against Russia. Whatever European war would offer to Russia a perfect opportunity to intervene. And once the Russian soldiers put their foot in Europe, they will hardly withdraw by their own initiative. The Russian intervention over the European affairs could be only prevented via the creation of a b*inding mediation treaty* between all the European States.

The third danger for Europe is constituted by the Russian orientation of some of her States, Germany above all. Today, *Germany* is closer from Russia that any other Western State. With Russia she celebrated the friendship treaty of Rapallo, whereas, on the other side, she denies entering in the League of Nations and thus to belong to the community of European States. A big part of Germans hopes that an alliance with Russia give them the opportunity to not comply anymore with the Treaty of Versailles and distribute again Poland.

This *orientation of Germany towards Russia* constitutes one of the biggest dangers for the future of Europe. An alliance of Germany with the Russian group of States would make of the *Rhine the bordering river of Europe*: the rest of the European world power would be a fragment depending of the Anglo-Saxon protection; the Pan-European idea would be buried forever.

The cause for the Germany Russophile is the *pression that exercise France* over her. Greater the tension between Germany and France, better will be the understanding between Germany and Russia. More Germany doubts of a compensation and collaboration with France, more she will throw her into the arms of Russia, if she wants to protect herself against a future isolation.

Depends, therefore, of the Western powers, and above all of France, that Germany continues with Europe or be rejected by her.

The truth is that in a long-term in the Franco-German conflict none of the States, nor France nor Germany, will win, but only Russia. Still today France could save for the family of European States the sister republic of Germany. Tomorrow could be too late. And, however, of this situation depends the future of Europe.

A lesser immediate danger to dynamite Eastern Europe is constituted by the *Pan-Slavism*. Only in the case of a profound change of the interior policy of Russia, this danger would become more dangerous. At that moment, not only would awake the Pan-Slavic memories of the southern and western Slavs but also Hungary and Bulgaria would try to conquer again their lost regions constituting an alliance with the Russian reaction. In this case, the power of Russia would be extended until the Adriatic.

Only the creation, at due time, of a *Pan-European federation* could repel these dangers. Never was a historical moment so favorable as the present one. Every month that goes by the situation can be worse, and is doubtful that, after a victory of the Russian reaction, it will be still possible the Pan-European union.

4. Balance and disarmament

Economic cooperation

Russia constitutes for Europe not only a *military* but also an *economic complement*. While Europe, together with North America, is the most important industrial zone of the world, Russia is, above all, an agricultural country. The young Russian industry, with exception of the one that existed in the neighboring country and that, with them, separated from Russia, was destroyed by the revolution.

Russia needs industrial goods, above all mediums of transport and agricultural machinery, and Europe needs grains.

Russia needs from Europe for her reconstruction, and Europe needs Russia. For this reason, between these two political complexes it

is needed a wider understanding, that must not fail for little difficulties reasons. The enmity between Europe and Russia would damage both and would benefit only the American industry, thus, as soon as in Russia the economic situation become more stable, will start the competition between the American, English, Japanese and European industries to conquer this great market of the future. In this race, the European policy must not be a ballast for the European industry. Europe needs more the commercial exchange with Russia than the British and American Empires, that has surpluses of grains. On the other side, Europe has a common border with Russia and could be the main supplier of Russia, if there is no political prejudices that obstacles the development of these two economic needs.

On the other hand, Europe could only escape from the economic catastrophe that is immersed because of the war through a commercial understanding with Russia and participating in the reconstruction of this country.

Both, Russia and Europe, need each other to incorporate themselves again. For at least one decade, both must try to resolve the economic problems before the political problems, and policy must be directed by the economy.

If Europe wants to be victorious in the competition with the English and American big economic regions, must appear in front of Russia as an *economic union*, because while being divided in the interior by customs barriers, she will not be able to resist the competition from those empires. The economic relationship of Europe with Russia, in the same manner than the political relationship, demands the union of Europe.

In the future big peace negotiations between Russia and Europe, the interest of her demands to appear as one voice. It must not be repeated the organized theatrics in Genoa, so regrettable and shameful for Europe. In the negotiations, one of the parts must be Europe, Russia the other. This way it will be easier to reach an honored agreement than if each of the European States engage in special negotiations with Russia to try to obtain via intrigues a little more of their neighbors.

At the same time, Europe must strictly observe the beginning of the no interference in the Russian matters.

World disarmament

The question of the *European disarmament* and the *world disarmament* is tightly related with the Russian question. While Europe and Russia do not sign a long-term peace, nor Russia, nor Poland nor Romania will reach the disarmament, but neither will France, because her allies of the East are too weak to be able to protect only themselves in the case of war. And in reverse, while the States of Europe keep armies to fight each other, Russia will not disarm herself, because she will never be sure that the European armies one day unite to attack together the Russian constitution.

The question of the disarmament is, therefore, in a vicious circle. There will be only an exit if the European States, through a binding mediation treaty, make impossible an Intereuropean war and invite later the other military powers, Russia, Japan and China, to a terrestrial *disarmament conference*, analogous to the maritime disarmament Conference at Washington.

Owing that Pan-Europa has a population twice superior to Russia, can, in the case of union, always gather an army twice powerful than the one of Russia. In addition to this, thanks to her industry more developed, has an inestimable military advantage over Russia, and in the future will be more important for war the development of the technique of a country than the number and courage of its soldiers.

When Russia sees escaping the only opportunity Political-Military that has against Europa, so to know the division of hers, will be convinced that a war has no sense and will declare herself open to a disarmament. The same will happen with Japan and with China, when they see disappearing the only menace they have by land, the Russian one. Then it will not be an obstacle for the total terrestrial disarmament, since in any case England and America would promote this agreement.

Thus, or it could be introduced the *general system of militias or the total suspension of the compulsory military service*. The

advancements, both morals and economic, that would be achieved with this would be incalculable.

A new era, a better era, could begin.

V. Europe and America

Pan-America constitutes for Europe
the worst danger or the greatest hope.

1. The United States of America and the disunited States of Europe

The situation of America and Europe

While the *forty-eight republics of North America* are politically and economically united, the *twenty-six European democracies* insist in their political and economic sovereignty and keep destroying themselves systematically each other with their policy, both in peace times and war times.

If we compare the *organization of the American States with the anarchy of the European States*, we can state the following:

The *United States of North America* is the richest country, most powerful and most advanced of the world. Their citizens are not subdued to a compulsory military service. Since more than a century they did not have any war in their territory. His industry and his agriculture are flourishing, and his material and cultural civilization grows every year.

Meanwhile, the disunited Europe has become poorer and in debt; because of his internal contradictions, is not relevant in the world politics. Flourishing nations has been devasted by the war. Her economic situation can not be resolved while the armament devours her resources and the compulsory military service absorbs a big part of her productive manpower. All countries live under the constant fear of war. Hate and jealousy that countries have for each other make impossible any collaboration. The general monetary chaos prizes the mercantilism and the speculation, while the results of an honored work go to stop the general situation of poverty. The industry, the commerce

and the traffic are strangled by the absurd customs barriers that divides Europe in economic parcels. The culture and the moral decline rapidly: every day continues the downfall of the spiritual and material European civilization.

America owing to his union his unmatchable ascend. Europe owes to her lack of union her unprecedented fall.

Europe incapacity to face the competition

However, Europe could find itself in such favorable situation like the United States, because is populated by the same race, has approximately the same weather and is ruled by the same democratic principle.

It is true that the United States of America has double the extension than the democratic continental Europe and her soil contains great riches, but Pan-Europa, on the contrary, has a population three times greater and disposes, therefore, of a manpower three times more numerous, and her colonies have an extension sixty times greater than the American colonies (Philippines).

Owing to that the external circumstances are even more favorable for Pan-Europa than for the United States, the cause of the decline of Europe resides mainly in the reason that North America is organized, while Europe is disorganized. The North American States fight together for their existence, while the Europeans fight each other.

The contraposition in the development of North America and Europe grows every day. The quality of life of North America increases, whereas the European decreases. If this evolution is not stopped in time through a European federation, all that remains of intelligent and applied in Europe will leave this poor, menaced, rotten and mean continent and will be installed in other parts of the Earth where there is more hope: America above all.

The European industry *will not be able to face the competition* of America in the world market, because is demanded to increase her

prices due to the customs that interpose, in a brutal and absurd way, between raw materials and the factories, between the mineral and the carbon mines and between the agricultural zones and industrial zones. In addition, must increase the prices due to the enormous taxes that Europe must to contribute to pay the charges of the past war and the armament of the future wars. On the other side, America has the advantage to produce at lower prices within his immense territory thanks to a more rational division of work. Thus, for example, in America exists one factory for every type of machine, and this factory produces for all the territory, allowing to reduce the costs to the maximum, while this division of work would result impossible in the national parcels of the European economy. This explains, for example, the no existence of a European factory of automobiles that could compete with the factories of Ford.

This *incapacity of Europe to face the competition* will be perceived, above all, in the industrialization of China and the reconstruction of Russia, the upcoming two big challenges for the world industry. And if this competition fight is lost by Europe, her ruin will be complete.

The salvation of Europe

It does not exist but just one medium to prevent this ruin: *the economic union* of the European continental democracies, the *collaboration* of this Pan-European customs union with Russia and the *disarmament* of the European armies.

But this program cannot be achieved but just on the base of a political union of the European States, that would substitute the war by the binding mediation Tribunal and would guarantee in a solidarity manner the common borders.

This way is the only way for the salvation of both political and economic parts of Europe. If Europe denies following this way, her States will be ruined, as small businessmen that want to compete alone with the *trusts*.

For the interest of all Europeans is necessary to follow this way of salvation: for the interest of the workers and the farmers, of the manufacturers and the businessmen. All peoples and all classes of Europe will be benefited of a flourishing European economy and all will suffer the consequences of the European economy ruin. The suppression of the Intereuropean customs borders will lead, after a great crisis, to the economic restructuring of the continent. Only the United States of Europe will be able to affirm in the future his economic independence face to the United States of America, not the diverse separated States.

2. Pan-America

The Pan-American union

The *economic* model for Pan-Europa is constituted by the United States of North America. The political model of the evolution of Pan-Europa is the *Pan-American Union*.

The conditions before the birth of the North American Union were completely different of the Pan-European conditions. In North America there is only one language, a people resulting of many mixes, a common constitution, a national sentiment; since his origin, constitutes a political and economic union (except for the Secession war). Europe, on the contrary, is divided by peoples and languages, is divided historically, economically and nationally. The sentiment of difference is stronger than of the community; the hate, stronger than the solidarity. Is not enough, therefore, fix the union as an objective is necessary also to build the road to the union.

For this enterprise, has a capital importance the acquired experiences by the republics of the American continent in their effort to constitute a P*an-American community.*

Despite that the Pan-Americanism is still in plain development, however, is much advanced than the Pan-Europeanism. For that reason, it can serve of guidance in many aspects for the Pan-Europeanism. Since, in both cases, is the attempt *to organize a*

continent in a community of world importance. In both cases, is the attempt of unite in *a regional federation of States*, without aggressive or imperialist objectives, but to the service of peace and progress, a sovereign States that are very different from each other because their history, language, economy, culture and temperament.

From this parallel, can be deduced the importance that has for Pan-Europa to know the Pan-American movement and the history of his evolution [8].

The Pan-American evolution

The Pan-American sentiment, which is the sentiment of solidarity of the new world against the old, has its first political expression in the *Monroe Doctrine*. A century ago, December 2 of 1823, Monroe, president of the United States, face the menace that constituted for the young South American independence the Holly Alliance, made the programmatic declaration that the United States will not tolerate any type of interference from Europe over the political configuration of America.

Sometime after, the liberator of South America, *Bolivar*, convoked at Panama a *Pan-American congress* with the objective of assuring for the liberated continent a long-term peace based on justice and solidarity. The congress reunited in 1826. The United States were represented by his State secretary Henry Clay, who, independently from Bolivar, was in his country the voice of the Pan-American idea.

The practical results of the Panama Congress were few. But there was born the idea of a Pan-American Union, that would have a decisive influence.

[8] The information given next are taken from the extraordinary work *Pan-America* by Alfred H. Fried (Orell Füssli Editions, Zurich).

At the beginning, the union attempts were limited to Latin-America, that found their expression in the Lima Congresses of 1847 and 1864.

The rebirth of the Pan-Americanism was produced in 1881, when the State secretary of the North American Union, James G. Blaine, invited all the States of his continent to a *Pan-American conference*. In this occasion, Blaine declared expressly that the North American Union wanted to negotiate with his Latin-American sisters in perfect equality and that the congress pursued pacific objectives: the United States of America has maintained thoroughly both promises.

All American States accepted with enthusiasm the invitation from Blaine. After the fall of the last American monarchy in Brazil, took place in Washington in the year 1889 the projected conference.

Blaine, the great pioneer of the Pan-Americanism, was elected president of the conference, which debates took place in English, Spanish, Portuguese and French. It was formed sixteen commissions, of which it is worth noting: of the *customs union*, of the *railway communications*, of *sanitation*, of the *monetary agreement*, of *banking affairs*, of *private international right* and of the *general welfare*.

The most important result of the first Pan-American conference was the approval of the resolution by which was created a mediation tribunal. In addition, it was decided the construction of an intercontinental railway, was reduced considerably the customs rights and it was constituted in Washington a Pan-American office of information.

This office of *information* was thought, at the beginning, only to recollect commercial news from all over America and distribute them to all the States, but little by little became the living center of the entire Pan-American movement.

Eleven years after the first conference, took place in Mexico the *second Pan-American conference*. Meanwhile, the Pan-American movement increased in importance and the Pan-American sentiment deepen in the spirits. With the only exception of Mexico, Pan-America adhered the Hague Convention.

The *second Pan-American conference* continued the work of the first. Expanded the office in Washington and its functions, was given the right to contact with all American governments through the diplomatic representations of these in Washington and was confide the guardianship of the files of the Pan-American conferences.

To manage the Pan-American office, it was created an administration council, to which belong all the representants of the American republics in Washington and which presidency assumed the

North American State secretary for foreign relationships. This administration council was set to meet every month.

In addition, it was decided to make the Pan-American conferences a permanent institution of the American politics, it must be celebrated periodically every five years (The World War interrupted this periodicity, and the fifth Pan-American conference had to be postponed from the year 1915 to the year 1923).

The *third conference* was celebrated in the year 1906 in Rio de Janeiro. Created the Interamerican mediation system and the Interamerican Right as well, reduced the formalisms of the naturalization and expanded the competences of the Pan-American office, that became a permanent committee of the periodical conference. To support this Washington central office, it was decided to constitute permanent committees in all the American republics.

The *fourth Pan-American conference* was celebrated in Buenos Aires. Developed also a mediation system, the international traffic, the mutual protection of the intellectual property, the science, the education: was approved a big scale Pan-American exchange plan between professors and students. It was expanded the competences of the Pan-American office, and this received the official name of *<<Pan-American Union>>*.

One of the most important promotors of the American movement was *Andrew Carnegie*, that put his riches to the service of this great idea and contributed immensely to development and to the success of the Pan-Americanism.

Pan-Americanism

These Pan-American conferences, the *fifth* of which is being celebrated now in Santiago de Chile, must be considered as stages of the movement towards the Pan-American union. But not only at this conference, the Pan-Americanism also has been accredited in other fields: in the solution of the conflict between the North American Union and Mexico in the year 1914 and in the pacification of Central America, which five republics reached a reconciliation after a never ending fight, thanks to the pacific intervention of their neighbors, and are in their way to constitute the *<<United States of Central America>>*.

To these practical successes of the Pan-American movement there is no need to add the *ideal values* that awake. Under its influence has born a Pan-American conscience, a sentiment of Pan-American solidarity and a Pan-American public opinion.

These practical currents and ideals are leading to a political, economic and cultural union narrower of the American continent to face the European and Asian continent: towards a *Pan-American League of Nations*.

The problem with this American League of Nations, that would be based in the Monroe Doctrine in opposition to the Geneva League of Nations, is now in the agenda of the fifth Pan-American conference of Santiago de Chile. Although it never came true during this conference, as it is previewed, it will be during some of the next conferences. Europe must be conscious of that, at the other side of the Atlantic Ocean, the States of the new world are grouping themselves to form the organization of the States most powerful of the Earth and that must adopt a position face to this historical event.

3. Pan-America and Pan-Europa

Pan-America, Pan-Europa

Pan-America constitutes for Europe the biggest danger or the biggest hope: danger, if Europe continues to be divided in multiple

States, while at the other side of the Atlantic an entire continent is organizing; hope, if Europe learns from her most modern daughter and completes the Pan-American movement with a Pan-European movement.

Every European politician interested in the future of his continent should study deeply the history of the Pan-American movement and get conclusions for Europe.

Due to the difference in terms of the evolution and the circumstances of both continents, cannot be transplanted to Europe, without a previous critique, the American institutions, but is necessary to examine deeply all that resulted to be good and usable to try to achieve in Europe, if the European situation allows it.

The Pan-Americanism is far more advanced than the Pan-Europeanism. While it has already passed a century since the proclamation of the Monroe Doctrine and since the convocation of the Panama Congress and that an entire generation since the first Pan-American conference, the European movement has not yet taken-off. Each day that goes by it increases the advantage of America over Europe, until the European men of State decide finally to respond to the fifth Pan-American conference with the first Pan-European conference.

Pan-America as a model

The State man that gives to the European powers the invitation for this conference, as in the past Bolivar and Blaine did with the Pan-American powers, would acquire unprecedented merits before his people, before Europe and before the world. His gest would awake a movement that sleeps in all the peoples and in all the European social classes and, that once awakened, would not rest until Europe is united and safe. Even if the first conference fails, this would not drawn the movement: soon would meet the second and the third conferences and would force to execute the plans that had failed in the previous conference.

The second condition for Pan-Europa coming true is the creation of a *Pan-European office*, according to the model of the Pan-American office in Washington. This central office of the Pan-European movement could be installed in Switzerland, in Vienna or in Paris. In his book, *Pan-American Union*, A.H. Fried comments that, if had existed a Pan-European office in the year 1914, this would have avoided without a doubt the war, and he is probably right.

The Pan-European movement, that can use the long experience of the Pan-American movement, must also imitate their goals: *fight against the war and promote the economy and the civilization*; reject, by principal, any offensive and aggressive objective and banish any hegemony. The Pan-Europa constitution must recognize the principal that the small European nations have the same rights than the biggest, as in Pan-America the United States of North America have the same rights than the republic of Uruguay and the republic of Paraguay.

Clear separation

If Pan-Europa starts from the same pacific and democratic principles than Pan-America, will not be in the future any rivalry between these two sister unions, but only solidarity. They will not menace each other but complement each other, honoring the rivalry with each other in cultural and peace actions.

The ocean that divides these two continents makes impossible any borders conflict, while his common culture guarantees his international friendship.

In this sense would be desirable that Europe could take in time the decision of withdraw freely from the American soil and sell to America their American colonies, above all the *Guyana*, because these colonies could provoke a territorial conflict between the old and the new world. The strict and consequent application of the Monroe principle could lead the Americans to consider as a matter of honor to not tolerate in their land any European colony: the probable consequences of this conflict between both continents would be huge for the white race.

In addition, the selling to America of the French Guyana for a price equals to the debts of war could alleviate considerably the problem of the world debt. The colonial acquisitions of France by means of war would compensate widely the loss of this colony, which future is not sure. On the other side, this acquisition would mean for the United States a political acquisition that has no price and the continuation of his buying traditional policy in the sense of the Monroe Doctrine (Florida, Alaska, Danish Antilles). France, that has concentrated his colonial empire in Africa and Asia and that would not be in condition to successfully defend his American colony, would win more than lose with the definitive liquidation of his debt. However, for the peace policy of the future, would be fundamental the disappearance of the last territorial border between Europe and America and that remains only between them the separation of the Atlantic Ocean.

England as intermediary

England would be the link between Pan-Europa and Pan-America. In her quality of great power in both continents, could not belong to none of both, without being at the same time enemy of the other. Historically linked to Europe and, in terms of nation, to North America, is called to intervene in both hemispheres in favor of the world peace, of the principles of democracy, to which she gave birth, and of the future of the white race, of which she is the defender in Asia, Africa and Australia.

The *British Empire, Pan-Europa and Pan-America*, all of them interested in the maintaining of the world peace and of the territorial Status Quo, united by the same political principles and by a culture and common origins, would be a long-term invincible guarantees of the pacific development of the world civilization.

On the contrary, if the peoples of Europe do not unite, then this unfortunate continent will become the center of international intrigues and the scenario of world wars. The great world powers will dispute with each other to inherit the rich European colonies in Asia and in Africa and make Central and Eastern Europe her area of influence. Thus, the ruin of Europe will not be a blessing for both neighbors and inheritors, but only war and hate.

VI. Europe and the League of Nations

First Europe must unite,
then humanity.

1. Critique to the League of Nations

The failure of Geneva

The *League of Nations at Geneva* represents the attempt of Wilson to extend to the entire world the Pan-American organization of States.

Europe, totally conscious that the reigning of the international anarchy between States lead inexorably to new wars of which she would be the main victim, accepted the proposal.

In the League of Nations was since the beginning two tendencies: *the organization of the world and the organization of Europe*. This dilemma has made the League of Nations that neither be converted in the Areopagus of the world neither in the European Federation: this internal dilemma was the cause of her failure.

The *world* League of Nations that Wilson had dreamt remained a utopia. Geneva was just a draft. Two world powers rejected the League of Nations: *Russia and North America*. The same did big countries like Germany, Argentina and Mexico and an entire series of small countries. In terms of political power, the League of Nations barely comprises the half of humanity: the countries that are not members are equally powerful than the member countries. Instead of becoming a parliament of Nations, the League of Nations remained as a *little parliament*. Had no right to act in the name of humanity, because is a simple representation of mixed States without order and concert that serve from her in the interest of her policy of power. If the League of Nations dare to touch the interests of those world powers that are his members, intervene for example in the Hindu or Korean question, these powers would announce their immediate withdraw, and no one could retain them. Indeed, the League of Nations has neither the material strength of an international army, neither the moral strength of an impartial justice. The sentences that has dictated until now have not been verdicts, but compromises. In Upper Silesia, in Vilnius and in eastern Galicia, the undefended League of Nations has capitulated before the Polish army.

The League of Nations at Geneva has damaged greatly his credit. On one side, has converted in an *impotent* political institution and, on the other side, in an unjust juridical institution. Not represents at world level neither a political authority neither a moral authority.

Inorganic structure

However, the idea of the League of Nations means an *enormous advance in the development of the humanity*, and every sincere pacifist must salute it as the first timid and wrong attempt to create a world organization instead of an international anarchy of States. The defects of the League of Nations came from not from its nature, but its organization.

The League of Nations at Geneva is *inorganic*: instead of grouping the peoples organically and the world States according to their economic, cultural and geographic affinities, groups mechanically, and without considering the geography, the history, the culture and the economy, big and small States, Asiatic and European, neighboring and far, as it were bricks. Inside it, Switzerland is not nearer than her neighboring Austrian republic or than Siam or Ecuador.

This inorganic grouping of the League of Nations, which is in contradiction with the Monroe continental doctrine, moved it away from the North American Union. And for the same reasons, Russia will think it twice before adhering to a group of States that constitutes a menace for the independence of her internal development.

The fundamental vice of the League of Nations is its *abstract* structure. For that reason, has no life and no repercussion in the sentimental life of the humanity, that, starting with the family and through the nation and the grouping of the peoples, lead us stage by stage to the world humanity ideal. The League of Nations do not consider at all these stages, skips the Pan-American Organization and Pan-European. By wanting to be all, is nothing. An alliance of three small States known as the Small Entente is a power factor in Europe more important that the League of Nations, that portraits itself as the spokesman of all humanity.

2. Pan-Europa and the League of Nations

Geneva and Moscow

Pan-Europa hast not remained unaligned by the League of Nations.

While Germany does not belong to the League of Nations, Europe is in danger to be divided in two sides, because today exists in Eurasia not only one but *two League of Nations*, confronted one to the other: one situated in *Geneva*, the other in *Moscow*.

Germany does not belong neither to the organization of Geneva neither to the one in Moscow, but whereas with the most important powers of the League of Nations at Geneva is in perpetual conflict, with Moscow has a cordial understanding. For this reason, it could happen that Germany, same as Turkey, Persia and Afghanistan, unite one day to the Moscow military alliance, instead of adhering to the Geneva pacifist society. The results would be the isolation of Poland and the move of the European border to the Rhine.

This constellation would mean *the end of the Pan-European idea and the end of the European peace*. First, Central Europe and the Balkans and, after, Western Europe would be the theatre of a new invasions of peoples.

It is of maximum interest for all the European peoples to prevent this evolution and secure the union of Germany with Occident. On this matter, Europe is betting her destiny.

Europe: political object of the League of Nations

But even in the case that Germany adheres to the League of Nations, this could not replace the Pan-European Union.

In its current form, the League of Nations constitutes a *constant* danger *for the European independence*. Through it, the extra-European powers of Latin-America, Eastern Asia and the British Empire can, with plain rights, intervene in European matters, while for example, Great Britain would prohibit any interference with his Empire by the European States, in the same manner the United States would prohibit any

interference with the American matters in relation with the Monroe Doctrine.

Through the League of Nations at Geneva, Europa becomes in the *object of world politics*, in the battlefield of world politics intrigues. Most of the problems discussed at Geneva are Europeans. And, however, in the Areopagus of Geneva Europe is represented only in an incomplete manner, whereas the South Americans, eastern Asians and transoceanic British, in terms of members of the League of Nations, have a decisive influence in the political configuration of Europe. In this manner, States that are not European decide over vital European affairs.

This paradox is still greater by the fact that Germany, Russia and North America, which interests in the European affairs are much greater, don't participate in these decisions, whereas the States of eastern Asia and South America act as judges over Europe.

Against *this tutelage of the League of Nations*, Europe must adopt a position. Must recognize how humiliating is her international position and defend her independence and self-determination. Must let that the League of Nations resolves the international problems, taking only for herself the solution of problems that are purely Europeans.

Europe for the Europeans

With a century of delay with respect of America, Europe must *announce to the world her Monroe Doctrine <<Europe for the Europeans>>*.

The American Monroe Doctrine is the expression of the American strongest will to oppose, as a one block, to every European interference.

When Monroe proclaimed this doctrine, Europe did not need to respond to this American manifestation of solidarity with a European doctrine of solidarity, because, in the first place, the Holly Alliance

represented then the union of Europe and, in the second place, Europe could not even imagine that powers that are not Europeans could ever dare to intervene in her internal affairs.

Meanwhile, the situation has changed in detriment of Europe. Whereas now America is insured against a European intervention, Europe has become the weakest and most vulnerable spot of the world politics.

For many years and in plain view, the Rhine has been occupied by British, Americans and Africans. The Turks, that were already expelled from Europe, entered in Europe victorious again, and the Russian soldiers advanced in 1920 to Warsaw and Lemberg, without awaking any sentiment of European solidarity.

If Europe wants to escape the destiny of becoming an international battlefield and the object of exploitation, is necessary to proclaim her European Monroe Doctrine: her solidarity against any attack or interference from foreign powers in the internal affairs. Is necessary to clarify that, same as America, she will not tolerate an interference of foreign powers in her internal affairs. Europe must claim for herself the same right that a century ago America claimed for herself.

This European attitude would have a big importance vis a vis of the *danger that Russia represents.* Any Russian intent of forcing a constitution modification in a European State, today in soviet sense, tomorrow in absolutist sense, should encounter the same unanimous repulsion that encountered a century ago the intent of Spain to introduce again by force the monarchy in South America.

Pan-Europa as a stage

In order to the *world organization* could replace the world anarchy, is needed that the States unite and constitute super states. As the union of Germany, Italy and Poland were previous stages for the union of Europe, equally the union of Europe is a previous stage for the union of humanity.

It is absurd to make an anarchic Europe the base for a world community. With her eternal conflicts would poison the air of the entire world before integrating in the international order. First Europe must unite, second the humanity. This process cannot be inverted.

The *enemies of Pan-Europa* will throw always the slogan that Pan-Europa is an ideal narrower and more limited than the League of Nations and that is immoral and not very political to limit geographically a continent the grouping for peace.

To sabotage the exigence of a European customs union, will demand the intercontinental free commerce. To sabotage the European pact of guarantee, will demand an intercontinental pact of guarantee. To sabotage the United States of Europe, will demand the United States of the world.

This tactic of *confronting the day after tomorrow with the tomorrow* never fails. A method much liked by the reactionary movements that consists in putting the mask of the most extreme radicalism to fight the progress with success. It is like this that these demagogues blind the masses with some long-term goals of which they do not believe to deviate them from other closer goals that they fear.

3. The Reorganization of the League of Nations

Group of States

The League of Nations, in its current state, is divided in four main groups:

1. The *British Empire* States.
2. The *European* States.
3. The *Latin-American* States.
4. The *Far Eastern* States.

Of this four groups, only the first is internationally organized. The delegates of the *British Empire* form *a coherent group* within the

League of Nations. The very Lord Robert Cecil, that until recently represented South Africa at Geneva, is now there representing England.

Any difference between Australia and New Zealand would be probably considered an internal affair of the British Empire and would be resolved at London instead of at Geneva. At Geneva only would be discussed the affairs that implicate a British State with other State not belonging to the British Empire.

Because of his attitude facing the League of Nations, the British Empire is an example for the other groups of States represented at Geneva.

When Pan-Europa constitutes herself in a federation of States, will be her that resolves the conflicts between the European States, passing to the League of Nations only the conflicts that such States have with the extra-European powers. In this form, the League of Nations *would not be in contradiction with the Pan-European Union but would be an extension of the same.*

It would be a big mistake from the Pan-Europeans to combat the idea of the League of Nations, instead of supporting it. The critique must only be directed against its mechanic structure, not against the League of Nations itself. While not exists a Pan-European organization of States, *the League of Nations is the only international forum* where the European States meet, the only protection against the inter-European chaos. For this reason, and from the Pan-European point of view, is desirable that Germany adheres to the League of Nations, because this step would lead Germany to the community of European States and not to the Russian.

Federalism between States

But at the same time, the Pan-European movement must constitute in the defender of the *Pan-European autonomy within the League of Nations* and the organization of this in *regional groups*. The goal of Pan-Europa consists in dividing the League of Nations in groups

of States and substitute the centralism of Geneva by an *interstate federalism*.

The big advantage of this regional structuring of the League of Nations is that would allow to the United States of North America and the Soviet Union enter the League of Nations without renouncing their international principles. With the recognition of America and the Soviet Union as groups of autonomic nations, they would not have anything to fear about any interference in their field of influence and the Monroe Doctrine, both American and Soviet, would remain safe.

This extension of the League of Nations to a *world organization* would give such moral distinction that it would not be longer necessary a League of Nations army.

At the fifth Pan-American Conference celebrating now at Santiago de Chile it is being discussed the constitution of an *American League of Nations*. This League of Nations, to which will also belong the North American Union, will be constituted one day or another and will have to confront her rival of Geneva. Thus, the American members of the League of Nations will have to decide to leave her corporately or to adhere her as a close group, similarly to the group of British States. From the decision taken by Pan-America of organizing or not as a group inside the League of Nations depends her destruction or extension.

With the withdrawal of the Americans, the League of Nations would be reduced to an association of Europeans, British and Asiatic-Eastern. If the last two groups withdraw, the remaining States would be the *Pan-European organization of States*.

But even without the withdrawal of the Americans, *it is also possible* the constitution of *Pan-Europa within the frame of the League of Nations*, if the European members of the League of Nations unite into a closer community, similar to the one that the British have today and tomorrow will have the Americans.

The *secession of the European delegates* and the constitution of a specific group of States would provoke a crisis for the idea of the

League of Nations but, at the same time, her rebirth.

The League of Nations could become in the supreme world instance, whereas the conflicts and the local matters would be competence of the closest group of States. These groups would be the following:

1. *Pan-American* group
2. *Pan-European* group
3. *British* group
4. *Russian* group
5. *Mongol* group

From these five super-State groups three already exist: the *Pan-American, the British and the Russian*. Their Super-Parliament are: the Pan-American Conference, the British Empire Conference and the Federated Soviet Republics Congress. The European and Mongol world are the only ones that are not yet structured.

The Mongol world is divided by the *Japanese Empire* and the *Chinese Empire*. The hate between these two-neighboring people, that results to us so absurd as to them the Franco-Germany enmity, makes improbable for a near future the constitution of a *Mongolian Union*. At most, this union could be accelerated with an aggressive policy of the white race against the yellow. While Japan and China don't want to understand each other in terms of a common world policy, will constitute two separated groups within a structured League of Nations, having this then *six groups*, i.e. four white groups and two yellow.

It is more urgent for us the *Pan-European Union* question than the Mongol question. Its constitution is a *conditio sine qua non* of the world regional structuring. It is impossible that four world powers or groups of powers remain as minority against five small European States. They would withdraw from the League of Nations and make it blow. Only the representation of a united Europe would have a decisive voice in the council of peoples.

Intercontinental balance

We don't have any reason to count on a sudden change of the *political mentality* of the humanity or to expect that the force kneels before the Right. If we want now a stable society of States, is necessary that the legal foundations lean on a system able to hold them.

The experience has showed that a federation has only expectation of subsistence if it is founded on a *strength superiority*. This superiority manifests itself either in a form of *hegemony*, when a member of the federation is more powerful than the totality of the rest (Prussia in Germany, the Great Russia in the Soviet Empire), or in a form of *cooperation*, when each of the members of the federation is weakest than the totality of the others (North America, Switzerland).

This cooperation must be founded in a kind of *balance* that excludes the danger of a hegemony. Indeed, the principle of cooperation is democratic, the principle of the hegemony if autocratic.

Both the Pan-European group of nations and the universal and structured League of Nations must be founded on the *base of the cooperation*, because neither in Pan-Europa would be a State strong enough as to impose itself constantly as lord of the others, nor would be a group of States that could do the same in a structured League of Nations. The five or six groups of power represented in the League of Nations, would be quasi balanced: none would dare in a near future to start a war against the rest of the humanity.

Thus, a structured League of Nations could be the best *guarantee of the world peace*. After a common disarmament, its groups could celebrate between them a mediation contract. The constitution of these groups would locate at the same time possible wars: the European powers would not be forced to intervene in a war between North America and Mexico or in an independence war in India or Korea. For the European States, the guarantees of reciprocity would be limited to the European borders. In this way, it would be reduced notably the danger of a new world war.

The League of Nations would be breaking down in the two elements which unhappy mix is the cause for its unviability: *the Pan-*

European Union and the world Areopagus. The Pan-European Union would be formed by the delegates of the European members, and the world appeal instance by the representants of the five or six groups of States.

Washington and Geneva

This *supreme council of world powers* would meet periodically and, in some sense, would become the successor of the *Conference for Disarmament of Washington*.

Last year met for the first time at Washington the representants of the great powers of the world, not to *put to an end* a war, but to *avoid* a menacing war. This mission of avoiding the war in America and in Japan, that would had constituted a cultural catastrophe of the first order, the Conference of Washington fulfilled it brilliantly. Its success shadows all that the League of Nations of Geneva have ever done until now.

America was represented at Washington by the *United States*, the British Empire by *England*, Europe by *France* and Eastern Asia by *Japan*: each one of the groups by its strongest power. Only Russia was not represented, because her government was not recognized by the other participants; but it is probable that in the next world conference Russia will be also represented. The maritime disarmament could be agreed without Russia, but not the land disarmament.

The work of president Harding at Washington has resulted to be more effective than the work of president Wilson at Geneva.

The future will lead to a *synthesis* between these two different attempts to reach world peace; from Washington will appear the world Areopagus, from Geneva will appear Pan-Europa.

VII. The danger of a new war in Europe

The world war has affected Europe.
A new war would give the final blow.

1. Danger of war

The European anarchy

Today, Europe is marching towards a new war. The majority of the Central and Eastern Europe States are preparing both diplomatically and military for a new war. Hate and envy between neighbors are greater today than in 1919.

The *international anarchy* that reigns in Europe is the responsible for this general danger of war. The situation of Europe today is similar than of twenty-six persons of a doubtful intellectual and moral level living together in a reduced space and armed to the teeth with toxic poisons, bombs, firearms and knives. All in an awful state, are looking for the opportunity to enrich themselves to the others expense. Eaten by hate and jealousy, the desire of vengeance and envy, they conspire, showing their arms, training with them, insulting each other, in public or in private, in the worst way possible. At any cost they want to renounce to what they, wrongly, conceive as freedom. For this reason, they prefer the system of absolute anarchy against any other organization, decided to end their opposing interests or their divergences of opinion by the way of duels or fights instead of choosing the way of the justice.

Not much imagination is needed to prophesize that sooner or later a ruthless war will explode between these savages and that, due to the agglomeration in this war, the wounds and death will reach not only to the participants in the combat but also to the ones not participating in it.

There is only a way to prevent this catastrophe: as these twenty-six persons are condemned to live together for an unpredictable time,

they must decide to make their lives the most bearable possible. And for this, they must replace necessarily the *anarchy for the organization*.

They must sit together around a table and constitute an organization that assures them the maximum of security with the minimum of sacrifice of their freedom. They must substitute the duel for the resource of justice, creating, for this, a mediation tribunal. They must even resign to the right of permanently carry arms, because this represents a permanent temptation to abuse of them. Finally, they must decide that any troublemaker or disturber of the peace that attacks any of their partners and not want to submit to the recognized ordained procedural will be rejected and punished by all.

Organization instead of anarchy

Here is the way that must be followed by the twenty-six European States if they want, in the last minute, escape their ruin:

---Organization instead of anarchy;

---Mediation tribunal instead of war;

---Disarmament instead of armament race;

---Guarantee of solidarity instead of self-defense;

---Cooperation instead of competition.

Nowhere in the world, except for the Far East, reign among the nations some relationships so primitive and so barbarian like in Europe. The Pan-American States, of the British world and of the Soviet Union meet periodically in conferences to examine, peacefully, all the pending matters between them and avoid potential conflicts, in the scope of a friendly justice. Through the pacific collaboration, they try to make the part of the earth where they are a place to live in the best way possible. All these States sacrifice a minimum of their freedom and are widely recompensed for this sacrifice with a juridical order and super-state.

Only the European States are obstinate with the privilege of the *armed anarchy*. They always speak with each other with gun in hand. They lean hardly to the principle of the *vendetta* and, because of proud and ignorance, they oppose to the introduction to the juridical order. They do not see or want to see that is impossible that twenty-six States, packed in a space of 5 million km^2, could live next to each other without crash and step each other and that the littlest of the pretexts is enough to transform Europe in a field of ruins and in a huge pile of cadavers.

Anyone that could be aware of this and that loves Europe must not be discouraged before any sacrifice if wants to keep Europe away of this mortal danger.

2. The war of the future

The war of extermination

If the leaders and the peoples of Europe could imagine exactly what the *next war* will be, they would not refuse any opportunity to prevent it. But men do not even suspect what is coming for them. Their imagination is too poor and in fact is more directed to the past than to the future. It is much easier to project to future past knowledge than make an idea of things that never existed. This is what happened in 1913: almost nobody could imagine a World War, which horror surpassed all that one could predict; this also the reason why almost nobody today can make an exact idea of a future war, which horror would surpass all that one can imagine in Europe.

The European imagined that the World War would be something similar to the 1870 war and imagine that the future war will be like the World War, but one thing is certain, the next war will exceed in atrocities and cruelty to the World War, as this surpassed the 1870 war.

Indeed, each year new technical discoveries are made, and with them, the means of destruction are perfected. The next war will not be made under the mechanical symbol but of the chemical instead. The next war will not be a war of steel weapons but of toxic weapons.

If a war breaks out among the big European powers, it would not be fought for the capitulation or the defeat of the enemy army, but the *extermination of the enemy nation*.

The next war will be conducted, beyond the frontline, against the rearguard, before all against the big enemy cities. Sons and women of combatants will be killed using toxic bombs, to prevent a future revengeful war. Frontline and rearguard will not be different, neither the difference between combatants and noncombatants. All cities at reach will be destroyed, all enemies that could not escape will be massacred.

The toxic weapons technique has made such progress since 1918 that in the future only will be needed a few bombs throwed from a plane to annihilate a city of millions of inhabitants. It would be ridiculous to expect that the persons responsible of the war will renounce to this powerful means, even if they accorded before not to use toxic gases: because the next war will be, literally, a life or death war; all weakness during the war could signify a suicide.

This future war will not end with a peace treaty but with the *annihilation of the defeated people*. The State that loses will know the fate of Cartage after the third Punic war.

The victorious nation, as a whole and without distinction of parties, will give their conformity to the annihilation policy of their leaders, because any other result of the war would put the victorious party in danger of being defeated and exterminated himself two or three generations later by his neighboring enemy, full of hate, in a revengeful war. If the neighboring countries don't find a *modus vivendi* between them, each nation will prefer rather to destroy its neighbor nation than to be destroyed, sooner or later by this one. In the life of the European States would be repeated what frequently happened between enemy families during the times of the *vendetta*: bloody quarrels to the annihilation of one of the sides.

A war of annihilation like this, in which would be implicated the other nations of the continent, would signify the *downfall of Europe*. The

surviving nation neither could overcome its quantitative and qualitative loses of men and materials.

No European victory would be rentable

If Germany, for example, founding on her sensational discoveries and seduced by ambitious adventures, started a revengeful war against France, in case of defeat would be destroyed, in case of victory, would remain ruined.

Whichever was the ultimate course of this war, one thing is certain: within the first weeks, the industrial region of the Rhine (and probably Silesia as well) would remain destroyed by the bombs. In this way, it could disappear one day the works at which the German people has dedicated for a century all their energy. No war reparation could heal this wound and give Germany the chance to never reach the advantage that would have taken the English and American industry.

A destruction war leaded and won by *France* against a big European power could grant her for a short period of time the uncontested supremacy of the continent. But this hegemony would cost her a lot: France, with her low natality, could not repair the human loses that a victory would cost her. Her population would be soon under the one of Italy and would not be capable of maintaining her hegemony and of repelling a Russian attack. Would end bleeding not only because a defeat but also because a victory.

There is no European nation that disposes of exceed population and riches to support a war, without carrying, in the best of cases, a uncurable wound.

The World War has left Europe touched; a new war would give her the final blow. The State man that signs the next inter-European declaration of war, will sign at the same time the death penalty of Europe. After this war, Europe will be nothing more than a field of ruins, as happens today with the Central Asian countries, where in the past flourished great civilizations; Berlin and Paris would share the fate of Babylon and Nineveh.

Whichever was the result of the future European war, the only power that will end victorious will be *Russia*. The self-destruction of Europe prepares the way for the Russian invasion, equally the self-destruction of China prepares the conquest of this country by Japan.

The struggle for peace: a national duty

Due to the political and technical conditions that this war would be presented with, anyone that love his people must be *pacifist*. The chauvinist nationalist that incites his people towards a new war, believing in good faith that serves his people, can be only forgiven because of his ignorance and his lack of imagination in front of the future.

Only the criminals like Erostrate or the men whose blind hate in front of the enemy nation is stronger than the love for his homeland, men that would be willing to pay with the destruction of his people the extermination of the enemy, can be propagandists of an European war knowing fully of its consequences.

To oppose with all means possible to this war propaganda must be for all European people, without distinction of nationality or class, a *matter or personal honor*. Whoever adopts a passive attitude front of the future war will have over his shoulders a part of the future responsibility of a war that will be yet much crueler than the previous one. *In a matter of life and death for the Europeans and the European civilization, cannot exist any neutrality.*

Whoever that do not take a decision and hence helps indirectly the ones that put-on fire Europe is guilty of high treason in front of his people, culpable of high treason in front of Europe and guilty of high treason in front of humanity.

3. Pan-Europa and the peace

Conference previous of the war, not after the war

It is necessary to use all means at reach to save the future European war to the world. Europe must follow the example of the great *pacific powers*. While the European States did not meet around the table until after having caused ten million of deaths and twice the wounded and having caused to their continent immeasurable damages, the Japan and the United States met at the Washington Conference when the war menaced to explode and signed the peace, without spilling a drop of blood. With this intelligent attitude, noble and generous, they saved to themselves and the world unspeakable sorrows and uncountable damages. Thanks to this, millions of persons saved their lives, their health and riches and meet at both sides of the Pacific Ocean shores in better conditions that if they would have won the war.

One cannot imagine how much better would be today the situation of the Europeans, not only of the defeated but also of the winners, if the peace conference would have been celebrated in the spring of 1914 instead of in the spring of 1919. The past cannot be changed but we can apply what was learned for the construction of a better world. Only this way Europe will take advantage of her terrible unfortune.

Pan-Europa, the path towards the peace

The political situation of Europe, even after the conclusion of the peace, is very unstable. There is in Europe *at least one dozen of open wounds*, from which at any moment it could start a fire capable of devastating Europe. Among all the European nations are ambitious leaders and parties that salute with enthusiasm any political crisis, because they expect that a new war takes them to power.

Results ridiculous optimistic to unite with the faith of those pacifists who expect that the European peoples, trained by the dark experiences of the last war, would deny entering a new war. Past years history contradicts this thesis. After the end of the World War, two European countries, that however knowing war by own experience, have conducted new wars: Poland, with her incursion into the south of Russia, and *Greece*, with the invasion of Anatolia. In both these cases,

the peoples followed their leaders blindly and entered the war, showing the incapacity of the League of Nations to prevent both wars.

Similarly, the other peoples would throw themselves to war, like in the year 1914, to the simplest sign of command.

Founding on this basis the hopes for peace would be a myopic and senseless endeavor. It is necessary to give peace many more serious guarantees that make impossible a war between the European states as it is today between the member of the North American Union or of the British Empire or will be tomorrow between the States of the American continent.

The mutual interests and relationships of the European States are narrowly entwined with each other, that two neighboring countries, in the long run, don't have any other alternative than the *hostility* or the *alliance*. It is no longer possible a correct neighborhood but indifferent. Europe can be only the theatre of an eternal war or of an eternal peace.

Only a *Pan-European alliance* can guarantee the internal peace of Europe, *through the guarantee of the binding mediator tribunal.* Nothing can weight more than the advantage that could suppose for Europe this political alliance.

The external peace of Europe

This guarantee of internal peace, that would suppose for Europe an unprecedented growth in every aspect, should be completed by the guarantee of an external peace. The united Europe should celebrate mediation treaties with England and Russia, Pan-America and the Far East, that prevent against an extra-European war.

The European States are today too weak as to impose a peace outside their zone of influence. They could not prevent, for example, a China-Japan war, or a Japan-American or Chinese-Russian, or an Indian and Korean revolution as well. It exists today in Asia many problems to resolve, whose pacific solution is currently far away and could provoke one day war conflicts between the great Asian powers.

As desperate this vision could be, Europe, that could not avoid these armed conflicts, must keep itself away from them and take care at least its continent to not be affected by future wars.

Thus, in opposition to what happens in Asia, in Europe is not possible a political success achieved through a war whose cost is not *one thousand times more than its price*. For this, in Europe the peace it is not only an ethic exigence, but also *a wisdom exigence*; an exigence not only of the Europeanism but also of the national egotism.

For this, *the European peace* must be the immediate goal for all the European pacifists, similarly to the American peace is the goal of the American pacifists. If peace is assured in the continent, the path will be open for the world peace. The reverse path would implicate Europe in every world conflict and would accelerate her fall instead of preventing it.

VIII. Europe after the war

If before, reason does not create it, will be necessity
that creates Pan-Europa.

1. The liberation of Eastern Europe

Metternich and Mazzini

Before the World War, Europe was divided in two systems: the *Liberal West* and the *Conservative East*. Most of the western nations were free, most of the eastern nations were oppressed.

Whereas in Western Europe the national self-determination principle imposed itself, in the East there were only three sovereign peoples: *the Germans, the Magyars and the Russians*; the other nations had a limited freedom.

Before the war, a Pan-European union would have forced the free western nations to violate their political ideals imposing them to *accept a guarantee* in favor not only of the permanent servitude of the Estonians and Latvians, of the Polish and Lithuanians, of the Checks and Slovaks, of the Ukrainians, Slovenians and Croatians, but also of the Italian provinces, Serbs and Romanians oppression from the monarchy of the Habsburgs. This guarantee would have been impossible to obtain, due that the sympathies from Occident for the oppressed nations were greater than for their oppressors. Without any doubt, Occident would have been able to celebrate political alliances with Orient for concrete ends, but not a superstate federation.

On the other side, *the mentality of the eastern Europe emperors* and their entourage prevented a European union, because a German, Austrian or Russian emperor, would have considered a dishonor to submit to a majority formed by democracies.

The Pan-European idea would have been considered in the East as the resurrection of the Holy Alliance in the spirit of *Metternich* and in the West as the renovation of Europe in the sense of *Mazzini*. It could not be thought about the constitution of Pan-Europa while of these principles do not triumph over the other.

The World War brought the decision: *Mazzini triumphed over Metternich*, the Occident over Orient, the liberal principle over the autocratic. With the fall of the last European empires, freedom was acquired by the oppressed peoples of the East. These peoples, once liberated, some organized in democratic republics and others united to their free brothers and cousins.

This *upheaval of the Eastern European nations* constitutes a decisive stage in the way towards Pan-Europa, because gave to Europe a homogenous appearance, based on the *national State* and *democracy*. The opposition between sovereign states and slaved peoples and Western Europe and Eastern Europe disappeared. Germany converted to a democratic republic and, in this way, in terms of its interior policy, united with the Western States. Russia was the only one that, due to the introduction of the Soviet regime, separated from Europe, whereas the peoples around united with Europe as independent national States. The resultant Europe had the half of the extension than before the war, but its internal political structure was, on the contrary, much more uniform.

National oppression past and present

Today, the most important European nations have inside their own States the center of national life. The tutelage exercised by some European peoples over others disappeared. The foundations for a *Pan-European association of free nations* were planted.

However, despite of this change, the national oppression in Europe did not disappear. Millions of *Germans, Magyars and Ukrainians*, as nations, they are still under the oppression of their neighboring countries. As unfair and censurable these oppressions of parts of a

nation may be, however these oppressed peoples of today have still their own States as national support and as free cultural center, whereas before the war the cultural nations of Europe were deprived of their national freedom.

Despite of these pockets of national oppression, that every good European should fight for the disappearance, it must be recognized some advance in the European political structure in relation with the time before the war.

Since the end of the Holly Alliance, never was Europe so mature as today for the political union. There are no more political obstacles for its federation, only psychological. With the reappearance of a Pan-European sentiment of solidarity, these psychological obstacles must disappear. To awake this sentiment is the noblest mission of all that form the European public opinion.

2. European politics and economy

Economic consequences of the peace treaty

The new map of Europe was designed in conformity with the *national* aspirations, not according to the *economic* needs.

Whereas the economic and technical development tends to suppress the customs barriers in place, the Treaty of Paris creates new barriers.

The great *German economic space*, with its model organization, was divided by the Danzig corridor and mutilated with the loss of Upper Silesia, Lorraine and the zone of Sarre.

The *Austro-Hungarian economic space* was dismembered; customs barriers were lifted around the recently founded Czechoslovakia, whose factories supplied, since long ago, of industrial materials most of the parts of the Habsburg empire. These barriers separate it from its oldest customers, forcing them to find other providers.

Vienna, one day the capital of an empire of fifty million, conserved just a poor and not very fertile *Hinterland* of at least 5 million of people, incapable of feeding this disproportionate capital.

The *treaties of Paris*, from the political point of view represent an advance in relation with the situation before the war, are a regression from the economic point of view. Thanks to the ephemeral successes of the demagogue nationalists, millions of people are in misery and the continent is menaced of the economic downfall.

Instead of applying to the national matters some national criteria and to the economic questions some economic criteria, *the economy was subordinated to politics* and in the cradle of the liberated Europe was planted the seed for its economic downfall.

The main causes for the European economic downfall are the following:

1. *The war*, that destroyed the commerce, the markets, the regions theatre of battles, the men and the moral.
2. *The exclusion of Russia* as consequence of the revolution, blockage and economic catastrophe.
3. *The huge weapons arsenals* and the permanent armies as consequence of the political insecurity.
4. The unresolved question *of the war reparations* and the crisis resultant of this situation.
5. *The general debt* facing the extra-European powers.
6. *The artificial division* of the *economic spaces of central Europe* defined in the peace treaties.

All these causes divide the responsibility for the European monetary chaos, of the unemployment, of the misery and the social disorder.

Economic reconstruction of Europe

To escape this chaos, *all Europe* must consider as an urgent task the rebuilding of the destroyed regions, elevate the work moral, find a definitive solution to the question of the reparations of war and the debt, recognize the Russian government and push energetically for the Russian economic recovery, proceed to the disarmament agreement with Russia and reestablish, through a Pan-European customs union, the broken commercial relationships.

All these problems, that are, in the first place, *vital questions of the continental Europe*, must be treated and resolved by common agreement in a Pan-European conference. A solution will only be found in the long-term pacification of this tired and wounded continent. While each State feels menaced by their neighbors, a suitable atmosphere will not be created for a Pan-European economy.

Only a *generous reconstruction* of Europe, made under a democratic and federal foundation, will remediate economically the division of Austria and Hungary and the mutilation of Germany. Those statemen

that only know how to destroy instead of building are beginners and demagogues that must disappear of the political stage of their destructive work and leave their position to building leaders.

More the need and misery increase in Europe, more will the peoples will recognize the need for an *economic policy*. Then they will happily renounce to a part of their sovereignty to eliminate the hunger, bankruptcy and war.

If reason does not create it before, will be the *need* that creates Pan-Europa. Europa has still the possibility of being today a work community. Tomorrow would be a suffering community. But then it might be too late, and Europe, united or not, would fall without any chance of salvation.

3. Pan-Europa and Versailles

Versailles and the peace

The Europe of today is the result of the *peace treaties of Paris*. All reconstruction of Europe must start from these treaties.

The European realistic politic has only these two possibilities: or to accept the peace system of the Paris treaties, with all its defects and injustices, or to choose the war and the chaos.

A new rectification of the new internal borders of Europe is something difficult to think about. With the current mentality of the peoples and their democratically elected politicians, a voluntary resignation of the conquered territories is psychologically impossible. The European victorious States would prefer entering in a new war before surrendering their German provinces that have been given to them, similarly Germany would not freely renounce neither to Posen nor to Alsace-Lorraine nor to North Schleswig. Therefore, whoever wants to change the current German borders, must conduct a policy of war. All pacifist must conform themselves, like it or not, with the borders fixed in the Treaty of Versailles, thus *whoever modifies these borders is modifying the European peace*.

But would be completely mistaken whoever sees in the peace treaties of Paris the European final evolution, instead of seeing in them the foundation for such evolution, because, with all the deficiencies, the treaties of Paris constitute the first step to escape the general chaos of the World War towards the reconstruction of Europe.

These peace treaties have decomposed the political structure, inorganic and out of line, of Eastern Europe into their constitutive national parts, not to increase the number of European States and, with this, the general confusion, but to give way to volunteer associations of independent republics that will replace the military and violent associations of States. The advantages of the old community should unite to the advantages of the new freedom. The analysis, the separation of Austria-Hungary could not have other sense that to liberate their elements for the synthesis of Pan-Europa.

If it is desired that the Pan-European movement has any chance of evolution, then it must begin from the current European system of States. *A Pan-European conference* that would have in the order of the day the revision of the borders fixed at Versailles, Saint Germain and Trianon, would be condemned to failure before ever meeting. The only hopes of success are if *by principle it would have excluded from the debate all territorial questions*.

Only under these conditions it would be possible to submit to a profound revision the second body of the Paris Treaty system, i.e., the economic body. In contraposition to the territorial peace conditions, the economic conditions *don't constitute a national honor question*, an untouchable question. They have been revised many times in the last several years and will be again in the future. Not only the defeated, but also the winners are interested in these revisions. The idea is to *depoliticize* all that is possible the problem of the war reparations and make of it a commercial question that must resolve for their mutual benefit the businessmen of both parts. This solution will be found when the adversaries abandon the pure nationalistic point of view and coincide in the general field of interest of Europe, because what represents an advantage for Europe it is also for France and it is equally for Germany. The same people that, in relation with Germans

and French, are enemies with each other, in relation with Europe must be allied.

European customs union

Once reconstructed of the North of France with the reparations imposed to Germany, the European economy has a more important mission yet to resolve: *the suppression little by little of the customs barriers between the European countries*, the fusion of the national economic areas into a Pan-European area, that would be the only one capable of competing with success with the American industry.

When this conviction would have imposed in Europe and, instead of competing, it appears an economic collaboration, then will automatically change all the previous economic conditions of the treaties and will push towards a friendly union.

But this friendly understanding will not become a reality while the business atmosphere is poisoned by the political problems: while the Germans demand the return of Danzig and the Upper Silesia and France continues working to disrupt the German unity. All these attempts to change the map of Europe conduct to war, whereas the recognition of the current political borders, along with the fight against the customs borders, leads towards the United States of Europe, in which the States borders will lose their current importance remaining to the level of simple administrative borders.

4. The Small Entente

The United States of Eastern Europe

The idea that the European States, if remain isolated, will be unreplaceable has given place to the constitution of the Small Entente. In this sense, the *Small Entente* could be considered as the *seed of Pan-Europa*.

With the withdrawal of Russia, Europe has been restructured in a different way, constituting three different groups: the Western Latin (Portugal, Spain, France, Belgium and Italy), the Germanic Center (Germany, Netherlands, Denmark, Sweden and Norway) and the Eastern, mainly Slav (Finland, Baltic countries, Small Entente, Hungary and the Balkans).

With this *group of Eastern Europe States*, appearing from the ruins of Austria, Hungary, Western Russia and the Balkan league, Masaryk wanted to build a federation short time after the end of the war, with the purpose of assuring to these nations a lasting independence facing Germany and Russia.

This group of States that goes *from Finland to Greece* that comprises the half of the European States and one third of both the territory of Europe and the Europeans.

The Small Entente

This great *federation*, that would have signified a huge step towards the United States of Europe, never became a reality. In its place only appeared the *Small Entente*, an alliance between *Czechoslovakia*, the kingdom of *Yugoslavia and Romania, Poland*, because of its alliance with Romania, and *Austria*, by the Treaty of Lana, are in close relationship with this group of States. The Small Entente continues with its aspirations, in the line of Masaryk's ideas, of extending to the north and to the south and of constituting the foundation for the United States of Europe, that are the goal they aspire.

Even with this current configuration, the Small Entente constitutes a *great European power*. Along with Poland, sums 70 million of Europeans within an extension of 1000 square kilometers. Has, therefore, along with Poland, a surface twice bigger than Germany, and its population corresponds to the one that Germany had before the war.

These United States of Eastern Europe, thanks to the alliance with France and to the skilled politics of their leaders, above all of Dr. Benes, have an influential position in Europe. In its entirety, have more inhabitants than any of the three biggest nations of Europe. With France and Belgium, this group of States has more than two fifths of the whole population of Pan-Europa and could become the crystallization core of it, if it makes of the Pan-Europa constitution the main goal of its politics.

But the current goal of this group of States is not the constitution of the European federation but protect themselves against Russia and keeping in line Germany, Hungary and Bulgaria. While the Small Entente does not reach to a friendly understanding with a democratic and disarmed Germany, will not be able to achieve its Pan-European mission and will be in danger of being pulverized some day by a resurrected Russia and by its German allies.

The Small Entente is the first symptom of a European reconstruction, of a restauration, through an alliance (synthesis), of the division (analysis) of Austria. But its economic mission, that was the opening of the way for the Pan-European customs union through a Danube federation, did not achieve it; the blame for this resides in the monetary

chaos of Eastern Europe, that makes almost impossible an international economy. This great mission must be achieved in the future.

In any case, it must be recognized the merit of the Small Entente to introduce in Europe a new political system that follows the American model and that unites the solidarity and equality of rights of the States in terms of foreign policy with the interior independence, building the political community through periodical conferences.

This system could be imitated by other groups of European States, for instance the Scandinavian countries, and the fusion of such groups could give way for a Pan-European cooperation.

IX. Germany and France

From the terrible crisis in which currently are France and Germany they will come out either as European allies or rather they will devour each other and blead each other out by the wounds that would have infringed to each other.

1. The Central European problem

Historical rivalry

The biggest obstacle for the realization of the United States of Europe it is constituted by the millenary rivalry between the two nations most populated of Pan-Europa: *Germany and France*.

The Frankish Empire, therefore, Franco-German, of Charlemagne sunk under the ruling of his son Louis. Of its ruins appeared Germany, France and Italy.

Since then, Germany and France are fighting for the legacy of Charlemagne, for the European hegemony.

Despite of its internal weakness, the *Holy Roman-Germanic Empire* maintained his prevalence in Europe until the beginning of modern times. Even Charles V attempted in his days to reestablish the universal European monarchy and break the power of France. The attempt failed, France came out stronger from the crisis and soon France began to reclaim the European hegemony. During the times of the Reformation, France passed to the offensive and forced Germany to stay in the defensive for three centuries. Under *Richelieu*, *Mazarin and Louis XIV*, France was without contest the first power of the continent. Napoleon continued in the same line and achieved to reestablish under the direction of France the European empire of Charlemagne.

Russia and England defeated the *Pan-European monarchy of Napoleon*, that dissolved into its constitutive national parts. Under the

direction of Prussia, began to appear again the power of Germany, conquering with Bismarck, in his victory over France, the prevalence in Europe.

But Germany could not enjoy for much time its power. The national sentiment gained such vigor, that there were any people that would have wanted to freely submit to the hegemony of another. Because of the fear of a new Napoleonic German era, most of the peoples of Europe united against Germany and its subjects, and the World War supposed the *crumble of the German Empire.*

Germany and France: sister republics

France finished with the German Empire, equally fifty years before the German victory finished the French Empire.

For the first time in world history, this two neighbor States are facing each other as *sister republics*. Both need to thank for their defeat to their form of State. Bonaparte and the Hohenzollern attempted to obtain the hegemony over Europe submitting the neighbor country: both lost the throne in this attempt, its people were humiliated and prepared the rising of their adversary.

Now the time finally came the historical moment for these two nations, liberated of their dynasties, to burry the ambitions and the aspirations of their ambitious lords and to sincerely reconcile with each other to work together for the reconstruction, in the union and the progress of Europe.

The union between France and Germany was not possible while they were ruled by rival dynasties; it continued to be not possible while France was a republic and Germany a monarchy: it is possible since the republican ideal unite both neighboring countries.

From this point of view, Germany conversion into a republic constitutes an important stage towards the Pan-European ideal. The return of Germany to a monarchy would difficult, at least, and would delay the European union, if it would make it impossible. With the

German mentality, a truly democratic ruling in the English sense could hardly be maintained; any other monarchy could break the European system of States, similarly some time ago the Holy Alliance broke the democratization of France.

The *republican thinking* has made during the last ten years more progress that the progress achieved during all human history. From the Pyrenes to the China Sea republican flags are weaving. One after the other, the Chinese, the Russian, the Austrian, the German and the Turkish Empires have been becoming in republics and, with them, one third of humanity. And it cannot be predicted when this evolution will stop.

Franco-German hereditary enmity

The political constitution of the two neighboring countries has changed, but not their moral constitution. Never was greater as now the hate between Germans and French. This hate is stronger than reason and stronger than common interests. Does not allow the sentiment of European solidarity to be born and prevents all Franco-German union, despite that the interest of both countries demands a collaboration.

This hereditary hate between *French and Germans* appears as an unbeatable obstacle for a European understanding. However, we believe for good reasons that this *hate is not eternal* and to a different external conditions will follow a different attitude of spirit. Because not only the political relations between the States are in function of national sympathies or antipathies, but also many times national amities or enmities are in function of the political relations.

In 1914 and in previous years, Serbia was considered as the number one enemy, in 1915 the number one enemy is Italy. rom this hate, that appeared then impossible to unroot, today there are no remains. Serbs and Italians receive the maximum sympathies from the Austrian people. For two-hundred years, Russians and Turks were mortal enemies; today are united by a close alliance.

In 1912, Serbs and Bulgarians considered to each other as “Slavs brothers” fighting together against the Turkish mortal enemy. In 1916 Turks and Bulgarians greet each other as “united Turanian brotherly peoples” against the Serbian enemy.

The Boers, that at the beginning of the century were the fierce enemies of England, are today one of the pillars of the British Empire.

In 1915, the Germans greet each other “May God punishes England” and composed songs of hate against England, whereas the hate against the French passed to a second level. Now, all Germany speaks with sympathy of England, whereas France has occupied the place as number one enemy.

Spain and France, Prussia and Austria, Venezia and Genova were mortal enemies for centuries, and today there are no remains of that hate between peoples. We can find innumerable examples like these. In every one of them it can be observed that, *as soon the cause of hate between the peoples disappears, the hare disappears.*

This historical observation gives us reason to trust that the Franco-German hate will also disappear, as soon as the situation that created it changes.

The Franco-German hate has been artificially maintained for centuries because of political-military motives. On both sides of the Rhine have been always people and classes with influence that lived of this political tension and were interested in preventing any long-term agreement.

Equally today private interests dictate often this mutual hate. Demagogue politicians and businessmen with economic interests extend their existence thanks to this hate, of which they obtain their fame and riches. Their lives would have no meaning if France and Germany reconciliate with each other.

It is evident that a hate so profound and so big cannot disappear overnight, that in the masses still resonates many things that were repeated to them for decades and centuries and that is needed a

strong counter propaganda to dissipate prejudices that have been accumulated on both sides.

But most essential is the *recognition of the Franco-German community of fate.*

While the European politics was also the world politics, what separates them was stronger that what united them, but today, when the future of Europe is in stake face to other continents, German and French interests coincide still more. The ruin of one of the countries leads necessarily to the ruin of the other. Between them must appear a *solidarity of reason*, even there where still is not possible a solidarity of love.

This love only can emerge, slowly and without forcing it, from the collaboration and the appreciation of the accomplishments of each one of them.

From the terrible crisis in which Germany and France find themselves today they will come out *as European allies* or will devour each other and *bleed each other by the wounds that inflict to each other.*

2. France in the crossroads

Politics of destruction and reconciliation

For *France*, the *vital question* of what every of its politicians must worry about in the first place is to *guarantee the security against a German invasion*.

The other borders of France are protected by the sea, by the Pyrenees and by the Alps. Only its *eastern border is open*. By this open door have penetrated three times for a century the German soldiers. The neighbor of France that limits by this open door is the most warrior and energetic people of Europe, superior to France in population and hostile feelings against her.

France must concentrate all its forces to protect itself against a new German invasion and must try with all means necessary to its reach avoid the German danger for itself and its descendants.

In this situation, France must find a foreseeable example in *the politics of Bismarck* with motive of the *peace treaty of* Frankfurt [9]. When the World War erupted, part of the critics of the politics of Bismarck blame this man of State that, renouncing to Belfort, gave to the French the possibility to victoriously reject the Germans; others reproach him to have awakened, with the annexation of the regions of Alsace and Lorraine, the unreconcilable hate of France and have placed the seed of a revenge war. Both groups were right. Exasperate an adversary without making it innocuous is the biggest mistake that it can be made in politics. The intelligent peace treaties conduct to the reconciliation (Peace of Nickelsburg) or to the adversary destruction (Peace of Carthage).

There are only two logical paths to secure oneself against an enemy: or making it inoffensive by destroying him or making peace with him through a *reconciliation*. Or he is deprived of his power for vengeance or take away his will for vengeance. Every intermediary solution, every oscillation between these two paths leads to the own downfall.

France must decide for a great *policy of destruction* against Germany or for a *magnanimous policy of reconciliation*. Any other decision would be a waste of time.

[9] Signed in 1871, that put to an end the Franco-Prussian war.

Path to destruction

Until now, France seems to want to try the first method. The goal of French *politics* of *destruction* consists in: a military border in the Rhine, an economic border in the Ruhr, destruction of the Reich unity, alliance with Poland and maintain the submission of Germany to isolate it from Russia, country that must be regarded from.

This policy of military *security*, of politics of *destruction* and economic *exploitation* has as goal the ruin of Germany and to reduce it to a permanent state of impotence. Because without carbon and mineral of iron the German industry will sink without remedy. The third part of the German population that lives of this industry will have to emigrate or die of hunger. Only this way it would be finished with the numeric superiority of the German people in facie with the French.

This policy of annihilation in face to Germany, despite of its inhumane character, would be perfectly logical from the political point of view, if do not despise a fundamental factor in the Franco-German politics: Russia.

There is no doubt that Germany, as soon as become convinced that the unmovable will of France to destroy it, will throw unconditionally and without thinking twice to the arms of Russia, without worrying if this Russia is Communist, Socialist, Democratic or Autocratic.

American capital, German organization and good harvests could arise Russia faster than Europe can imagine. From this moment, Germany and Russia would lead a common policy oriented to the destruction of Poland and of the Small Entente and the defeat of France. France would not confront then with 70 million people but with *a block of peoples of 250 million of people that goes from the Rhine to the Pacific Ocean*. This block would see grow daily its population, its riches and its power, while France, with all its weight of its preparation for war, could not face the competence with the Anglo-American economy. If, meanwhile, the communism was substituted in Russia by other system, the Small Entente, led by their sympathies for the Slavs, would be inclined to the side of Russia and would leave France isolated from Europe.

In a war between the block German-Russian and the western powers, the Red Army would arrive at Rhine before than the American army. Even in case of victory, France would remain so weakened that could not resist for a second the Russian attack, that has more capacity of resistance.

The French politics of annihilation leads, therefore, after some initial successes, *to the infallible downfall of the own nation*; opens the door to Russia to enter Europe, giving Germany as ally; transports, this way, the European border of Berezina and the Dniester to the Rhine and to the Alps; and puts a weight over the European continent for the war and the bankruptcy. Leads, is true, to the end of the German independence and economy, but pays with its own existence this ephemeral victory.

At the beginning of this policy of annihilation is the ruin of Germany, and to the end the ruin of France. Russia is the third party that laughs, that would gain the hegemony over the European continent without any effort thanks to this European brotherly war.

Path to reconciliation

When France realizes of these consequences and recognizes that cannot destroy Germany without falling itself in danger of death, will must abandon this wrong path and start with decision *the path to reconciliation*. The goal of this path is Pan-Europa: close collaboration with a democratic and pacific Germany, reconciliation over the foundation of some provided war reparations, customs union to the assemblage of German carbon with the French iron mineral in a *Pan-European steel industry*, mediation and guarantee treaty, protection against Russia, common defense against the reaction, disarmament, altogether reconstruction of the European economy and finances, establishment of the Pan-European federation.

This *program of reconciliation*, with its logical rigor, guarantees much more the future of France that its program of annihilation. The guarantee of solidarity in relation with the eastern border of France provided by all the States of Pan-Europa constitutes a much more

trustable protection than the occupation of the Rhine. Instead of being a permanent place of international intrigues, Germany could become in the wall of protection of France against the Russian danger. Thanks to this reconciliation with Germany, France could suppress the compulsory military service, heal its finances and concentrate all its energies in the organization of its colonial Empire. Its preeminent position in Pan-Europa would guarantee it a world position of the first order and the maximum title of glory of which a nation can be proud: *be herald and pioneer of the human rights*.

3. Germany in the crossroads

Revenge politics of Germany

Germany also is in the crossroads. Does it need to head down towards the East or towards the West, towards *a revenge policy or towards a reconciliation?*

In Germany reigns the general conviction that France uses the peace treaty as a weapon to continue the war by other means and destroy Germany, both politically and economically, as it did military.

Thus, the German public opinion is inclined to believe more everyday that only a new war will save it from the destruction from France, a new war in which will find freedom or death, a war that is preferred by the patriots to a new life of dependency, humiliation and poverty.

The supporters of this idea, whose number increases every time that France hits Germany, are conscious, however, that its disarmed country is today too weak military as to been able to throw itself into a new war. Thus, they put their hope in the future. In the school and in the press is stirred the nationalism and the hate, they aspire to a new militarization, establishing a military dictatorship or a return to monarchy, and promote world intrigues against France and its allies.

They found their hope in three possibilities of been able to win France someday:

1. In the possibility of a new German *invention* that allow them to annihilate with a single blow the military superiority of France (for example, a new poison o new electric waves that can make explode from a great distance gasoline, gun powder and explosives);
2. Over *dissensions between France, on one hand, and England and Italy, on the other,* that could modify the politic constellations in Europe and isolate France.
3. Over a *Russia* that, reestablished with the help of Germany, reconquer Poland and bordering countries and after uniting with Germany they defeat France and the Small Entente.

However vague they may be these hopes, is understandable that a people that see themselves with despair abandoned to an enemy power hold on to any mean that before or later hope to obtain help and salvation.

From these three hopes of Germany, the Russian is the surest. It is uncertain only the moment for the Russian resurrection, but not the resurrection itself. Thus, the aspiration of every German revengeful politician is a close political, military and economic *alliance with Russia*. And as the League of Nations could be an inconvenient to these alliance plans with Russia, reject the entrance of its country in the League of Nations.

This *German revengeful politics* has consequences so catastrophic as the French policy of annihilation. Promotes the national hate against France and makes difficult, with it, any future understanding, leading, in matters of interior policy, or to Bolshevism or to the reactionary movement and, in matters of foreign policy, to the dependency from Moscow.

The maximum hope of this policy is a victorious war of revenge against France through an alliance with Russia. If German patriots will realize exactly of the unavoidable consequences of such victory, they would claim it with less enthusiasm. Because, on one side, the industrial region of the Rhine would remain destroyed forever at the beginning of the war, in the manner that Germany would not be able to

recover this advantage that has over the others industrial States, and on the other side, Russian hegemony would extend to Posen and Upper Silesia, to the Bohemian forests and the Alpes. The German independence would disappear and, with it, the ide of a free Europe.

German politics of reconciliation

Facing this German revengeful policy is the *German policy of reconciliation*. Their goals are identical to the French policy of reconciliation, and its aspiration the pacific understanding and economic collaboration with France, the payment of a reasonable sum in reparation concept, the understanding with Poland and with Czechoslovakia (reject of any irredentism), a democratic interior policy, a pacific foreign policy, a mediation treaty and of guarantees, entrance to the League of Nations and rejection of any alliance with Russia: as ultimate goal, aspires to a customs union and, in close collaboration with France, to the constitution of Pan-Europa.

The force of persuasion of the revengeful policy is greater than the reconciliation policy, because each act of strength by France against Germany gives it more energy. As the hope for a reconciliation with France fades away, more Germany has to familiarize with the desolated hope of a future war of revenge and has to promote much more the policy of desperation, because, despite all, it seems to be more bearable the dependency from the Russian friend than from the French enemy.

Only a generous act from France, like, for example, the voluntary resignation of the Rhineland occupation in compensation for an inter-European guarantee treaty, could achieve the believe from Germany of the will for a reconciliation from France and give a mortal blow to the revengeful policy.

4. Chauvinists and Europeans

Logic and inconsistency

The decision of Germany is on the hands of France lead politicians. While governs in Germany a democratic regime, it is not too late for a reconciliation. But none can predict for how much time this regime will be able to face the nationalists and when will arrive the moment that it will be too late for a reconciliation.

But Germany can neither create in the French the doubt of its wish for a reconciliation, because, if not, France shall, by conservation instinct, achieve with rigor its policy of annihilation, without considering the future consequences.

Equally, Germany, as soon as it doubts of the possibility of a reconciliation with France, shall logically incline for a policy of revenge and orientate without any doubt towards the East.

Both French and Germans have no other option than the policy of hate or the policy of reconciliation. The crisis is so advanced, that does not allow half measures. Must decide for a policy or the other.

Whereas the politicians of the destruction of both sides aspire to a specific and consistent goals, it cannot be said the same for the politicians of the reconciliation. Many times, they lack courage to be consistent. In France they say, for example: “We want to take from Germany, without any consideration, the most amount of money possible and then we will try to establish a friendly neighboring relationship”. In Germany they say: “We want to continue the peace with France, but we must to reconquer Upper Silesia and Danzig and, for that, we must to ally with Russia”.

Those who speak like that are myopic or blind. These French do not think that, if they do not achieve neither the destruction nor the reconciliation with Germany, will be forced to return the an amount one hundred times more that the amount of the reparations for the war damages; and these Germans do not suspect that if Germany

celebrates an alliance with Russia against Poland, this alliance automatically will lead them, wanted or not, to a war against France.

Thus, every German must be sure of he wants, if a *Russian politics* or a *European politics*; must know that an alliance with Russia leads to war and an alliance with Europe, to peace; that an alliance politics with Russia ends in a dictatorship, red or white, and that an alliance with Europe ends in democracy.

Every French must have always present that their eastern borders only can be defended either *militarily*, through a permanent state of war, either *politically*, through a European pact of peace. Must know also that to come out of the current marasmus thee are only two possible ways: *the national imperialism* or *the democratic Europeanism*. Must decide: either to sacrifice the future of Europe, after a short hegemony of its nation, either to found the future of its nation in a Pan-European world power. If he inclines for the latter, must break then with the tactic used until now by France and seek not only the peace but also *the alliance with Germany*.

This choice will divide, each time with greater clarity, both German and French foreign politics in two opposed sides: the *chauvinists* and the *Europeans*.

Chauvinism and Europeanism

There exists an *alliance* not recognized but intimate *between the French and German chauvinists*. They cite each other daily in their journals, daily they conquest to each other new associates and do propaganda of each other in a collegial way. The real enemy of this Franco-German chauvinism is not the nation on the other side of the Rhine, but Pan-Europa. Against this goal is directed all their hate and their alliance, because they know that the creation of it will private them of their reason to be.

Only a *solidarity action from all the Pan-Europeans* will allow them to combat with efficiency this chauvinist alliance from one side and the other of the Rhine.

The *World War* appeared due to the general revolution of the minorities that love the war in the different European States against the majorities that are enemies of the war. Today we are living a repetition of this fatal conspiracy, which can only be suffocated with the international collaboration among all peace-loving Europeans.

In this campaign against the chauvinism it must be assigned the roles in such a way that the German Pan-Europeans fight against the German chauvinists and the French Pan-Europeans fight against the French chauvinists. The inverse tactic would harm more than benefit the Pan-European cause. Each one has in their own country so much barbarism to combat that has no right to blame his neighbor before himself becoming Europeanized: “If each one sweeps away whatever is in front of their door, all streets would be clean”. Only when each one of the peoples attempt to surpass its neighbor in justice and in civic virtues, will the Europeanization make progress on both sides of the Rhine.

But, while France follows an anti-European policy, will be supporting the German chauvinists; and while Germany follows an anti-European policy, will be supporting the French chauvinists.

France is forced, in front of a unreconcilable Germany, to have a policy of annihilation and, vice versa, Germany in front of a unreconcilable France, will be forced to have a policy of revenge. *This vicious circle* only can be broken if each of the Pan-Europeans decide to start for *themselves*, and without waiting for no one, a real European politics. In this way, not only would benefit the European continent, but also to their own nation, which culture he would elevate many levels with this initiative.

X. The national question

The nation is the kingdom of the spirit

1. The essence of the nation

The European nations as a mix of peoples

The dogma of the European nationalism declares that the nations are blood communities.

This dogma is a *myth*.

After the numerous migrations of peoples that has experienced our continent in the prehistoric era and along its history, it is impossible that still exists in *Europe pure races*. All the European peoples (with exception maybe of the Icelanders) are mixed peoples: mix of Nordic, Alpine and Mediterranean races; mix of Arian invaders and Mongoloid primitive habitants, mix of blonde races and obscure, short hair races and long hair races.

It is a sophism of beginners to conclude that exists a Roman, another German and another Slavic *race* because there exists a Romantic, another Germanic and another Slavic linguistic group. Since French and Romanians are not united by a blood community (outside the European): Romanized Gauls and Romanized Dacians. The *Spaniards* are Romanized Iberians, Basques and Visigoths with a Moorish influence; the *French* are Gauls and Franks; the *Italians* Etruscans, Celts and Germanic with Greek and Albanese influence, and equally the *Serbs*; the *Bulgarians* are Finno-Ugric with Slavic influences; the *Germans* are mixed in the south and in the west with Celts elements, whereas the ones in the east of the Elba are Germanized Slavs with Germanic influences. Therefore, according to blood, Prussians are closer to the Czechs than to the Swabians. Not even the *Scandinavians* are pure race Germans, because are too mixed with Finnish and Lapponians elements.

The best proof that the fanatic nationalists are not consistent in practice with their myth of the race is that they try everywhere to melt by force in their own people the national minorities that they consider inferiors. Therefore, they are practically convinced that with the force and the school can be converted a German into a French, a Polish or a Czech, and vice versa, equally can be transformed a Magyar into a Romanian, etc.

People that defend the thesis that the nation is a blood community are uncovered before realities like these: there are prominent Germans of Bohemia that have Czech names and vice versa; the most important Magyar national poet, *Petöfi*, was of Slavic origin; the most famous German philosophers, *Kant* was of Scottish origin, *Schopenhauer* of Dutch origin and *Nietzsche* of Polish origin; according to blood, *Bonaparte*, Gambetta and Zola were not French, *Shaw and Lloyd George* were not English, neither *Cesare Borgia* was Italian, neither Columbus was Spanish; by their precedence, the kings of England, Belgium, Netherlands, Denmark, Norway, Greece, Bulgaria and Romania were Germans, and the kings of Spain, Italy and Sweden were French. Therefore, in the strict sense, *of all the European States the kingdom of Yugoslavia has a national dynasty*: in all the other European monarchies are *rulers of foreign origin* who incarnate the national symbol.

Therefore, the theory of the nation as a blood community, any way is considered, lead us to internal contradictions.

The nation as a spiritual community

However, there are European nations and would be absurd to deny their existence, but these nations are not *blood* communities but *spiritual* communities. In relation with the blood, they do not have common ancestors, but spiritually they have *common masters*.

The nations are the fruit of mutual relationships between intelligent peoples and their great men. A genius without a people does not create a culture. A people without great men is not a nation. The peoples

generate their guides, their genius thinkers, their poets, whom, at their time, through the language, the religion, the art and the politics, transform the people that they belong spiritually.

All people reach to their plenitude of their conscience only in the person of their genius sons. *Mohammed* was the creator of the Arab nation because was the creator of the Arab culture. Likewise, in some sense, *Dante* was the creator of the Italian nation. *Luther* of the new German nation, Hus of the Czech nation. *Corneille and Racine, Voltaire and Rousseau, Bonaparte and Zola* were the ones that remodeled the French nation, *Kant and Nietzsche, Goethe and Schiller, Wagner and Bismarck* the ones that remodeled the German nation. Today it seems to exercise an analogous influence *Tagore* in the Hindu nation, *Masaryk* in the Czech, and *Mussolini and D'Annunzio* in the Italian.

The nations are, therefore, symbiosis, communities between great men and their peoples, that are at the same time their fathers and their sons, their creators and their creatures.

The true nationalism religion consists in the *cult of heroes*. A people feel united through their common heroes, that tries to imitate, through their ideals and their common ideal figures, through their guides, poets and common gods. The Homeric songs and the Gods of Olympus created a nation from the Hellenes, mixed people and politically divided.

A people first group together around some legends and common songs, after around some religious ideas and, lastly, around a common literature.

Generally, the *mother language* is the external common link that unites the members of a nation. But not always the national community coincides with the language community. Sometimes the *religious or historical community* is sensed as a link stronger than the language. Hence, the *Irish* consider themselves a different nation as the English, despite that the English is the mother language of the majority. Likewise, most of the *Croatians* consider themselves a nation despite that they are united with Serbs through a language and a common race.

But in both cases the religious and historical contraposition weights more than the language community.

On the other side, the *cultural community* can, despite the difference of language, lead to a national conscience, like in the case of China and India.

The nation as a Church

During the *Middle Ages*, when European culture was only *Christian*, despite de different languages, the West felt strongly their national unity than today. At the times of the Crusades Europa *had a faith, a God, a Pope*, an ideal of knighthood, a scientific language. The fight of the united Christendom against the Mahommedans and Jews was, in the plain sense of the word, a national fight, because religion was back then the element that united and, at the same time, the element that separated.

With the division of Western Christianity, with the laicity of Europe and with the Enlightenment it disappeared the spiritual bond that had united the peoples internally. Language replaced religion; the nation to the Church.

In every European people appeared a *national literature*, that multiplied and extended thanks to the printing. With exception of the illiterate, the Europeans divided themselves in readers of the German, French, Spanish or Italian literature. Each one of these readers felt themselves as student and disciple of their great writers, whose thinking they adopted with enthusiasm.

Hence, due to their national literatures, Europe divided itself in a whole series of great *communities of students* that, due to the difference of language, could not understand each other. Finally, the establishment of the mandatory learning forced each European to enter in one these national communities of students.

These *communities of students of the European spirit are the nations*. Are secular religious communities, united by the sacrament of

language and the cult of poets and national heroes.

School, literature and press are the organs of the modern nation. These organs transmit in little dose to the nation the thoughts and doings of their great guides, thus working constantly for the glorification of the latter.

Understood this way, the myth of common origin of a nation contains a *symbolic truth*, because the children of a nation have in actuality a common origin, are brothers, *but not by blood but of the spirit.*

As the Arabs come from Mohammed, hence the Chinese proceed from Confucius and the Jews from Moses. A Jew that abandons his faith exists, at the same time, of his nation, because the common origin history of the Jews is also a myth scientifically unsustainable. In front of the diversity of their language (Yiddish, Spanish, Arab), the common faith constitutes still the national link.

The nation is the kingdom of the spirit; all modern culture in Europe is national. Therefore, anyone that feels respect for the spirit, *must feel respect also for the national thinking*.

National chauvinism

As well as the other face of the coin of the religious idealism is the *religious fanatism*, the *national chauvinism* is as well the other face of the national idealism.

This *chauvinism*, that manifests itself exteriorly in the *contempt for the foreign nation*, appears because the nationalist only learns to know, and to love works of their own literature, thoughts and actions of their own heroes.

The cultures that are not accessible for them, because they do not dominate the language of these, seem to them inferior and barbaric. The less he knows his neighbor, more he has contempt for him. Makes the *mistake of perspective* of seeing his own culture, for the fact that it is nearer, as greater than the other foreign cultures and more distant. As he does not know foreign languages and lacks, therefore, the

measure to value his own culture, falls into the *delusion of national greatness* and becomes blind front of the great qualities of the foreign nations.

This explains the fact that the nations have adopted the intolerant posture that before pertained to the religions. All people considers itself as the chosen people: the *French* see themselves as the “Great Nation”, the *Italians* as the legitimate successors of the Roman Empire, the *Germans* as the true cultural people that must save the world, and the *Slavs* as the people of the future.

This delusion of national greatness, that share also the smallest nations, is artificially stirred by the press and the schools and it is felt also in the politics. The demagogues know, due to large experience, that they can count with a sure applause as soon as they praise the national vanity and extol the superiority of their own nation over the foreign nation. They quite often use this experience: from the imaginary superiority of their own nation they deduce the moral right of that nation to impose over their “barbarians” enemies their superior culture, to denationalize and subdue them.

The main representant of this national chauvinism is the *bourgeois intellectual class*, that knows well his own culture, whereas of the cultures of the neighboring peoples he has just a fragmented vision. The illiterates are immunized against this chauvinism because they know so little of their own culture as well as of the foreign. The universal spirits are also immunized because they are so familiarized with foreign cultures as well as with their own and love and respect also the great things of the other cultures.

The same as the past *Enlightenment* destroyed the fanatism, thus the future Enlightenment will defeat the chauvinism and will open the path for the *tolerance between the nations*. This tolerance will complete the love towards the own nation and will set the foundation for a cultural renaissance of Europe.

2. The European nation

The European pantheon

Every nation is a sanctuary. It is the shop where the culture is forged, the crystallization point of the civic virtues and the progress. As well as the cathedrals were before the center of the religious life, today the universities are the center of the national life. A war against the national thinking would be a war against the culture. A fight against the national chauvinism would be compromised gravely if not standing before the idea of the nation.

The national chauvinism cannot be combated with an abstract internationalism but through the deepening and expanding of the national culture towards a European culture and by the diffusion of the idea that all European national cultures are essential parts, close linked and inseparable, of a great and only *European culture*.

To know this European cultural unity, the peoples of Europe must know and appreciate also the spiritual guides of their neighbors. It is necessary that they know how much they owe them or could owe them. The path to achieve this goal leads to the diffusion of the linguistic knowledge and of the translations.

In the heart of the Europeans, the national pantheon must be expanded and become in a *European pantheon*, where the place of Shakespeare is alongside to Goethe, Cervantes alongside to Dante, Nietzsche alongside to Voltaire, and Hus alongside to Spinoza. If instead of delving into Buddha and Lao Tzu and making fun of the superficiality of the French culture, the Germans begun to assimilate the thinking of the great encyclopedists, they would realize immediately how many are the links that unite these with the classics of Weimar and of the close relationship that unites all that is great in Europe.

The European nation

As we talked of the Hindu nation or of the Chinese nation, despite that these peoples speak many different languages, the Chinese and the Hindus could speak about us with plain right as the *European nation*, like the great university whose faculties are constituted by the

German, French and the rest linguistic communities. Culturally, Europe is, in fact, much more homogenous than India. India is divided by a great number of languages and innumerable dialects, by many religions and many sects and by the contradictions of their castes and races.

On the contrary, Europe is united by the Christian religion, by the European science, by the art and culture, that rest on a *Christian-Hellenic* foundation. The *common European history* began with the Roman Empire and the great invasions and continued with the Papacy and the feudalism, the Renaissance and the humanism, the Reformation and Counterreformation, the absolutism and the Enlightenment, the parliamentarism, the industrialization, the nationalism and the socialism.

The constitutions and the laws of the different European States are without comparison much more similar with each other that were in his days the constitutions of the Greek cities-State. The Europeans are united by the same style and way of living, by the same social structure, by the same points of view about the moral and the family, the same manners and the same habits and the same dressing manners, which modes are subjected to the same oscillations. Also the artistic currents in painting, literature and music have in Europe an international character: romanticism and naturalism, impressionism and expressionism. Also are identical the problems of the interior politics and the economic life.

In comparison with all these common points that has the European life, the linguistic disconcert of Europe lose all importance, much more if considering that many of these languages could be considered as simple dialects.

The cultural unity of the West gives us right to speak of a *European nation*, that politically and language wise is structured in diverse groups. If this sentiment of belonging imposes over a Pan-European culture, all good German, French, Polish and Italian will be also a good European.

These Europeans of Romance, Germanic and Slav language will be the holders of the world culture of Europe, that has produced so many

great things in every field of human existence and is called to produce them also in the future.

3. Nation and borders

The minorities question

It is impossible to fix with complete justice the borders of the European States, because almost always the considerations that decide the establishment of the borders are in contradiction with each other. These points of view are:

- *Linguistic border*
- *Geographic-Strategic border*
- *Historical border*
- *Economic border*

This difficulty is yet bigger in *Eastern Europe*, due to that there it is impossible to fix exactly the language limits, due to the language mixture in specific regions (for example, Banat of Timisoara, Dobrich, Macedonia) and the national enclaves (Magyars districts in Romania; pockets of German language in Czechoslovakia and Romania; Romanian and Albanese language communities in Greece, etc.).

Before the impossibility of fixing in Eastern Europe fair borders, the winner States of the World War decided to cut with sword this Gordian knot. Leaning on the principle of power, at the moment of fixing the borders, they achieved to impose at the maximum of their national, historical and economic aspirations. There where the Right had failed, triumphed *the power*. If the defeated would have been the winners, they would not have acted any other way: Brest-Litovsk and Bucharest were an example.

The result of this forced fixing of borders is that the Polish, Czechs, Romanians and Yugoslavs imposed their national aspirations at the cost of the Germans, Magyars, Bulgarians, Ukrainians, Lithuanians and Albanians.

For this reason, each one of the national States of Eastern Europe that triumphed in the war host within their territory great minorities. The most part of these *national minorities*, that are oppressed by the majorities, put all their hope in the downfall of their new homeland provoking a new war. Without patience, wait the reappearance of Russia and of Germany and the downfall of the entire Eastern European politics. The core of this hope is constituted by *Hungary*, that was the most affected by the new trace of borders.

Instead of avoiding, thanks to a magnanimous policy or reconciliation, this internal and external danger that forces them to a arms race and that ends their finances, the governments of the winner States, trying to impose to the minorities a forced nationalization and through some draconian norms about the use of language, the close of schools and all kind of obstacles, push the minorities to a resistance even more desperate. This politics must logically lead to a generalized war in Eastern Europe, that at the end will give way to the hegemony of Russia.

In Western Europe not enough attention is given to this danger. There is only one way to avoid this danger: *an authentic protection of the minorities* through the general proclamation, by the nations, of an Edict of tolerance, that would constitute the Magna Carta of all European nations.

This *Edict* of tolerance must allow every person, without any reservation (as far as it is technically possible), to use their mother language before the tribunals and in front of the Administration, without this could suppose any prejudice whatsoever, and to educate their children in their cultural community.

Separation between State and nation

It is necessary to be conscious that the nation has succeeded the *religion*, both for good and bad, both in *humanism and in fanatism*. Today, men live and die, kill and lie for their nation, like time ago they did for their religion. To overcome the fights between nations, is

necessary to follow the same path that conducted to the disappearance of the religious fights.

Today, the national States are based practically in the national principle of *Cuius regio, eius religio*. The dominant nations try today by force to denationalize the national minorities or force them to emigrate, equally they did time ago the dominant religions with the religious minorities. To force people to adopt a nationality against their will constitutes a barbarism so great as to force people to adopt a religion.

Every civilized person must fight for the *nation* to be converted tomorrow in a private thing of each one, as it is today the religion. The *future separation between nation*, cultural entity, and State, political entity, will be a cultural action so important as the separation between Church and State. The concept of "National State" will fall in disuse the same that the one of State Church and will withdraw before the principle: *The free nation in the free State.*

Because the nation belongs to the reign of the spirit and cannot be limited to border poles. The German nation does not end in the Reich border: Austrians, South Tirolians, Germans Bohemians, Germans Polish and Germans Swiss belong to the German nation, not less than Prussians or Bavarians. Neither was born with Bismarck nor has been defeated by the World War, because in the kingdom of Goethe and of Nietzsche and one of the most fruitful schools of European culture. The German nation is so independent from the German Reich like it was in his days the Catholic Church from the Church States, because is situated in another level. Thus, the peak of the German culture with Goethe coincides with the biggest humiliation of the Reich by the part of Napoleon. The same can be said about the Italian Renaissance or of the splendor of the Greek culture, that coincides both with the age of the biggest political dismemberment of these nations.

Conscious of these fundamental differences between nation and State, a German from Czechoslovakia, for example, must act according to the principle "*Give to the Caesar what is from the Caesar and to God what is from God"*. If he demands that his State recognize him as citizen with plain rights, must, on the other side, fulfill with all their duties as citizen in front of the State, without denying his cultural belonging to

his own nation. Must try at the same time to be a good citizen as Czech and a good German as a person. In Switzerland, long time ago this position is something evident because there it reigns the national freedom. In Eastern Europe will be in place this attitude as soon as it is proclaimed the Edict of tolerance. Then the voices that demand some national borders will shut up, because the belonging of a specific State will constitute a second order question.

This separation between nation and State will facilitate everywhere the economic resurgence and the solution for the social problem as well. Will purify the European political atmosphere, now poisoned, and will prepare it for the Pan-European solution. Any other attempt to resolve the national problem leads, on the contrary, to wat and, with it, to the downfall of Europe.

Suppression instead of rectification of borders

Europeans must be conscious that their demand to fix some *fair* borders are unachievable, but what it is achievable, on the contrary, are some *stable* borders. *Alsace and Lorraine* are a warning. A new war would substitute old injustices for new ones, paying this displacement of borders with millions of bodies and mutilated. Some bad borders are always better than a victorious war. It is time already that Europe finally, following the example of America, puts to an end this modification of borders and renounces to the attempt of modifying them by force. If the American States were constantly disputing with each other the justice of their borders, they would have a permanent war. But they are more intelligent and almost everyone is happy with their unjust borders and against nature: Europe must learn from them!

Only exists one radical path to resolve permanently and justly the question of the borders. This path *is not called modification of borders but the suppression of borders*.

The European that, for the love of peace, renounces to any modification of the political borders must put all their strength for the suppression of these borders for national and economic reasons. *The Pan-European Edict of tolerance* deprives from the state borders their national meaning, and the creation of a Pan-European *customs Union* deprives them of their economic meaning.

If it is given satisfaction to these two demands, then disappears the points of friction that could give place to a European war. The State borders are reduced to regional borders and lose any importance. As it is today completely indifferent for an inhabitant of Wittenberg that his hometown belongs to Saxony and to Bohemia.

The political hate between neighboring States will disappear by itself, as soon as are suppressed the economic and national causes of that conflict. It is enough that a Pan-European legislation limits the artificial provocation of peoples at the school and in the press and with a law, redacted in the same terms, punishes most severely *possible and as high treason crime against Europe all hate propaganda against a nation.*

An exchange of professors, students and pupils will accelerate the reconciliation of nations.

Within the framework of the great Pan-European economy, each nation will arrive to the plain development of its culture in a pacific competition with their neighbors.

XI. Paths towards Pan-Europa

With a federal union, all the States of Pan-Europa would gain more than they would lose.

1. The stages for the development of Pan-Europa

Pan-European conference

The evolution of the European anarchy to the Pan-European organization will be developed in stages.

The *first step* towards Pan-Europa would be the announcement of a Pan-European conference by the part of one or several European governments.

This initiative, that would produce around all the continent an enthusiast echo, could come, for example, from *Italy*, the only Pan-European power that maintains friendly relations with all the States of the continent.

The Small Entente also would be in conditions to announce this conference. It acted before as mediator in many European crisis and would have the maximum interest to achieve the European federation.

This initiative could also come from Switzerland, which international and federative structure is a model for Pan-Europa and enjoy, in addition, of full trust around the continent. The same could be said of *Spain, of Netherlands and of the Scandinavian countries*, whose neutrality in the war preordain them to be mediators in peace times.

As far as first continental power, *France* also could take the initiative to achieve the unity of the continent, as they did in their day, in its continent, the United States of America. With this initiative, its prestige would increase hugely, without its power risk at all.

Finally, also *Germany* would be called to pronounce itself in favor of Pan-Europa. A long-term peace offer and a binding tribunal of mediation directed to all European States, together with a Pan-European guarantee of respecting the borders established in the Treaty of Versailles, would propose again before the public opinion the European question and would return to Germany the respect that has lost.

The program of this *Pan-European conference* must remain clearly delimited. The territorial questions must remain excluded from the debate and commissions must be created for *the following questions: mediation tribunal, guarantees, disarmament, minorities, communications, customs, currency, international debt and culture*.

The first conference must make the decision, following the example of its Pan-American sister, of meeting periodically and of founding a *Pan-European office* that centralize the unitary movement, according to the model of the Pan-American office.

Mediation treaty

The second step towards Pan-Europa is the conclusion of a binding mediation treaty and guarantees between all the democratic States of continental Europe. Each State can prepare by their own part this step celebrating binding mediation treaties with others European States. But those States that are firmly decided to not begin, under no pretexts, an offensive war can constitute a *Pacific Association*, with a binding mediation tribunal and some mutual border guarantees. The advantages that this association would bring to their members would be so dazzling that all European States, one after another, would freely adhere to this association. In this Pan-European mediation treaty it would be admitted also England, but not in the guarantee treaty, because this latter would implicate Pan-Europa in every future wars of Asia and the Pacific.

Customs union

The *third step* towards Pan-Europa would be the formation of the Pan-European *customs union*, that would make of Europe a homogeneous [10] economic area. This European economic restructuring cannot be made suddenly but little by little. But what is really urgent is to begin with energy the preparation for the suppression of the customs barriers. Also, in this field some States could provide an example, for instance the successor States of Austria, constituting customs associations and even monetary. Extending and uniting such associations, it could be prepared and accelerate the constitution of a Pan-European economic area.

[10] The Pan-European customs union question is deeper every day, in view of the preparations for the creation of a Pan-British customs protection system.

Pan-European constitution

The culmination of these Pan-European aspirations would be the constitution of the *United States of Europe* as example of the United States of America. Pan-Europa would appear in front of the other continents and to the other world powers as a unity, whereas inside the federation each one of the States would have two chambers: *the chamber of the peoples and the chamber of the States*. The chamber of the peoples would have three hundred deputies, one each every million of inhabitants. The chamber of States would have twenty-six, one representant per each one of the twenty-six European governments.

In Pan-Europa, as it happens in Pan-America, must reign the principle of the *equality of rights of all national languages*. But, for *technical* reasons, all European States would have to decide to introduce as mandatory language in every school the English language, first in the secondary schools and after in primary schools. In the *extra-European* world, the English language is becoming unstoppable in the *language of the international relations*. It would be wise by the part of the Europeans to follow the example of the Japanese and Chinese and obtain the consequences of this reality. If each European, besides his national language, dominate the English as auxiliary language, would end this rivalry of the European languages and would promote considerably the international understanding. Because the English language is easy to learn (that should have a reform in its orthography) and because its intermediary position between the Germanic and Roman languages, is preordained to be the natural Esperanto.

2. Pan-Europa and the States

Advantages of the federation

With a federal union, all the States of Pan-Europa would gain more than they would lose. The advantages more important are:

1. *Insurance against an intra-European war*
2. *Europe neutrality* in world conflicts

3. *Protection against an invasion* either from a Red Russia or either from a White Russia
4. *Capacity to compete* with the American and British industry, and in the future with the Russian and with Eastern Asia

To continue with the current European politics would bring with all security the following consequences:

1. A *new European war* that would lead to a total devastation and the depopulation of the continent
2. Constant Political-Military i*nterference* in European matters from the extra-European powers
3. A *Russian invasion* and the establishment of a Red or White dictatorship
4. The *necessity of an arms race in Europe* until reaching the financial exhaustion of the continent
5. *Incapacity to compete* in front to the Angle-Saxon industry, bankruptcy and economic slavery

Besides the general advantages, most of the European States would obtain specific advantages.

The *Eastern European States* would be the ones to obtain the greatest advantages. Pan-Europa would ensure them a long-term existence, existence that today must be grateful only to the importance of Russia and Germany. They would be liberated of the oppressive charge of arms, that is over their strength and that destroy their finances.

The *Small Entente* would be protected in front of the danger of the Habsburgs, the *Scandinavian countries* in front of the Russian danger, and the Balkans in front of the Turkish danger.

Germany would be protected from attacks from their neighbors, protected from the reactionary movement and from the Bolshevism, and could find themselves in Pan-Europa, superior common homeland, with their ancestry brothers that live beyond the borders of the Reich.

The *national minorities* would have in all the States an immediate advantage, because they would not have to fear neither persecution, neither oppression, neither loss of nationality. In Pan-Europa, superior common homeland, would find again, in pacific manner and without the spilling of blood, the path that leads them towards their countrymen, path that in another way would find only through the devastation of their homes because of war and massacres.

The African colony

The European *colonial powers* will have guaranteed the possession of their colonies, that, if keeping isolated, before or after would go to the world powers.

On the contrary, those European peoples that, due to their geographical situation or their historical destiny, are in disadvantage in relation to the distribution of the extra-European world, like the Germans, the Polish, the Czechs, the Scandinavians and the Balkans, would find in the immense *colonial African territory* a vast field of activities for their economies. Could come to help, above all, the Belgians and the Portuguese in the exploitation of their African empires, because they cannot administer them correctly.

Because the great *European African colony*, that comprises all the Western part of that continent, is still in great part open for exploration. And to transform it into the barn and source of raw materials of Europe, it would be needed to do two fundamentals jobs:

1. Partial *transformation* of the *Sahara into a cultivable land*
2. *Eradication of the sleep decease from Central Africa*, that makes the colonization impossible and the raise of cattle in their richest regions

These two problems, that depends the future of Africa, cannot be resolved neither by the generals, neither by the politicians, but by the *engineers and* the *doctors*. Only the united forces of whole Europe can

resolve these problems and achieve the cultural and economic development of Africa, once conquered politically.

3. Pan-Europa and the political parties

Pan-Europa and democracy

All European *democratic political parties* have the duty to support together the Pan-European movement. The creation of a Pan-European federation constitutes, in fact, the only secure *protection* of the *European democracy* against the Bolshevism and the reactionary movement.

The antidemocratic political parties of the extreme left and of the extreme right must pursue also, if they want to be logical, an anti-European program. The *communists* pursue the union with the soviet Russia. The national *chauvinists* pursue seek the hegemony or, at least, the unlimited sovereignty of their own nation. Some want the soviet dictatorship, others the military dictatorship. Both are decided to throw Europe into a new war. To achieve these goals, the European communists form a block between them, while the European militarists support each other indirectly.

In front of these foreign policy goals that the communists and the chauvinists pursue hardly, the democratic political parties of the center do not have a *positive* foreign policy *program*, neither the bourgeois social democrats.

The official program of the *social democrats* in terms of foreign policy has as a final goal the establishment of the social democrat *world republic*. When divided the socialism in the second and third International, this program was discarded by default. The social democracy is conscious that today the victory of the world revolution means their end. The process against the social revolutionaries made evident that the hate of the communism against the social democracy is bigger than against the bourgeoisie. For this reason, the social democracy must abandon the world revolution program until the Marxist unitary front is reestablished.

In a similar situation to the one of the social democrats are found the *bourgeois democrats* of Europe: one group defrauded by Lenin and the other group defrauded by Wilson. In the latter and in his program

the bourgeois democrats founded all their foreign policy, and the *League of Nations* supposed them a disappointment of the same proportions than the world revolution for the social democrats.

The consequence of all this is that the *two biggest European political parties of center have lost their orientation in terms of foreign policy* and follow the path of opportunism. This disorientation favors the extreme radical political parties: *to the communists and the chauvinists*. The latter, thanks to their positive and active foreign policy, have acquired a big advantage over the political parties of center, which foreign policy is fundamentally negative and consists only in the rejection of the chauvinism and the militarism, the capitalism and the bolshevism.

The current politics of the European democrats consists in that the twenty-six European States live in peace with each other, but separated, and if they confront each other, each one on their own, to the competition of the Western world powers. It consists in a myope and unachievable goal, because the European States, due to their world geopolitics situation, are forced to live together or against each other, but not beside each other.

Every European political party must decide either for the downfall of the current Europe, through a new war, or either for its union through a Pan-European federation. The democrats will decide without any doubt for the path of the peace, that coincides with the one of the democracy and of the federation.

Bourgeoisie and socialism

The leaders of the European socialism recognize, with more clarity than the leaders of the bourgeoisie, the need for the Pan-European union. As a proof, I will quote one of the most radical socialist leaders of Germany, Georg Ledebour [11]:

“Instinctively, the capital, similarly to the proletariat, tends to the world economy. But, as soon as the capitalists from a country feel the need for a political-economic fusion of their own productive regions with

the ones of the neighboring country, the tendency for the monopolist exploitation of the capital itself impulse them primarily to the annexation or, at least, to the union of these neighboring regions with their own State. But this capitalist aspiration to augment the power menace constantly in becoming in a ‘national’ war with knife in hand.

If Germany wasn’t completely disarmed, we would have now this ‘national war’ because of the Ruhr region. For the moment, the military occupation has not produced more than a passive resistance, which unavoidable consequence is the exhalation the national passions.

Find the way out of this horrible quarrel is the most urgent task of the French and German proletariat. Of the understanding of the need for fusion of France and Germany production zones, need recognized today even within the capitalist milieu, we must conclude the urgency that Europe to be united and to constitute a united economic region. At any rate, this union would be just achieved, as soon as socialism reaches the power in every country.

[11] *Wirtschaftseinigung Europas* (appeared in Klasenkampft), 1923.

The socialism, that will regulate every world economy, must liberate immediately the humanity of the paralyzing customs barriers that exist between the States, similarly to other chains of exploitation. But event today, when we must fight for the power within a political capitalist structure, we can direct the European States organized in a capitalist manner the demand for the economic union. Because a union of this kind is not at all in contradiction with the capitalist economic system. On the contrary, a general necessity impulse us now to it over the close national borders.

However, it is not likely probable that the fallen apart capitalist order of Europe has still inside the necessary strength to heal itself. If achieve healing, the capitalist would extend with it its lifespan. This is not at all opposed to the interests of socialists. The natural perfection of the capital system paves the way to socialism. In a Europe oriented towards the economy it will be achieved much sooner, and with more strength, the international union of the proletariat with views of a class struggle. From our side, we are preparing the way to socialism as far as we are promoting the ascent of capitalism in Europe to a higher stage in its evolution.

Like France and Germany are currently implicated in the conflict of the Ruhr due to the necessity of an economic union originally common, conflict that blinds businessmen of both countries, prisoner of their nationalistic ideas, it is a duty of the French and German proletariat show the path to salvation, that is the United States of Europe. If the capitalist classes fail in this task, then the socialist order will replace much sooner the capitalist chaos".

A great part of the European social democracy of all countries thinks similarly to Ledebour.

The position of the bourgeois political parties of Europe in front to the problem of the federation is less clear, however it will decide the destiny of both. Once more, history gives them the opportunity to achieve a greater and creationist action. If they fail in this test and allow the prevalence of little interests over the world historical needs, they will show the bankruptcy of their class and their incapacity to continue

directing the destinies of Europe. Stronger arms will take charge of their inheritance and will complete the work that they could not conclude.

The *Pan-European ideal* offers to the democratic political parties the chance to achieve a *positive and active foreign policy*. With this program, which advantages are clear and which sacrifices are minimum, the European democracy will be able to regain territory that were took by the communists and the militarists. The force of persuasion of the Pan-European program in terms of foreign policy is secured because breaks the close framework of the chauvinist perspective without losing themselves in the clouds of the cosmopolitanism.

Under the sign of Pan-Europa, the democratic political parties, now defeated, of all the European States will be able to unite to fight together against the European reactionary movement. A parliamentary action completed at the same time in all European States to force the Pan-European Conference, could introduce the offensive against the united democratic political parties of Europe and to manifest its power in front of the inter-European reaction.

All the European deputies that are neither communists nor chauvinists have the duty to debate in their parliaments the European question and fight together and with decision to find a solution.

4. The adversaries of Pan-Europa

The enemies of Pan-Europa

Every struggle demands a specific knowledge and their motives: also, the struggle for the European union.

The *adversaries* of Pan-Europa are divided in four groups:

- *Chauvinists or nationalists*
- *Communists*
- *Militarists*
- *Industries protected by the customs*

The adversary with more voice, but the most dangerous, against the Pan-Europeanism is the national *chauvinism*, that will see in the Pan-Europeanism a circle that surrounds his nation, will paint the danger of a general denationalization like the American model and, in the interest of freedom and national honor, will protest against all abandonment of the national sovereignty.

The *communism*, whose power in Europe is little, will fight the European consolidation and all rejection to the communist intervention, presenting an impossible demand to accomplish: the welcoming of the soviet Russia in the Pan-European federation.

The *militarism* will fight the Pan-European project, because makes it impossible a new war, that he strongly desires. Between these militarist adversaries of Pan-Europa are found ambitious officers and politicians, that profit from the weapons industry and all those that expect to obtain benefits from a new war.

The *fourth group* of the adversaries of Pan-Europa is the most dangerous and the most powerful. To this group belongs those *industries* that owe their existence to the customs protection, because, within a Pan-European economy, they could not face the competition those industries that profit from some markets, not for quality reasons or for the low prices but just for the customs protection that blocks the foreign products when these are better and cheaper.

Customs protection and free exchange

The fight for maintaining the customs barriers is for these industries a fight for their material existence. For these, a Pan-European customs union means their ruin. For this reason, will fight against Pan-Europa with all their means at their disposal. They will buy journals and will put at the service of this fight. They will command to the specialists in political economics to write books and articles where they prove that the inter-European free exchange means the ruin of Europe. They will try to stir England against the Pan-European union, they will support the nationalists and militarists and they will talk of national honor, when in actuality they are only thinking about their own interests. They will try to

use the communists, their mortal enemies, as battle horse against the Pan-Europeanism and with demagogue mediums move the working class against Pan-Europa.

The demand of national customs barriers is closely related with the danger of a *European war*, that forces each one of the States to prepare itself for a new war with their neighbors and to consider itself, therefore, as a possible fortitude that, in case of need, must produce itself all that is needed.

But as soon as the danger of a European war disappears thanks to the inter-European understanding, it disappears the need of the national economic closed space, i.e. the *national autarchy*. This fusion of this peace question with the customs problem explains the interest of the industries protected with customs taxes for the maintaining of the international anarchy and the hostility between nations.

To politically justify the fight against the free exchange, the protected industry is declared of national interest, and its disappearance as a national catastrophe.

This is a unilateral thesis. In general, the industrialization of a region does not bring the happiness of its population: is not used to increase the comfort and decrease the misery. In Europe still exists many *large estates* that wait for distribution.

In most of the European countries the agrarian reformation could liberate enough territory to absorb the workers that would have lose their job because of the disappearing of the customs barriers and national industries.

A suppression of the inter-European customs barriers, accompanied by social reforms, above all the agrarian reform, would not harm neither the nations nor the workers, but only that group of industrialists that are not capable of facing the free competition of the great inter-European industry.

To been able to fight this enemy with efficiency, the most dangerous and most powerful of the Pan-Europeanism, is necessary that unite all

those industries that do not have to fear a foreign competition and that, with the free inter-European commerce, could acquire new markets. These industries are, on one side, the ones that are *solidly established* and, on the other side, the *monopolistic industries*. These can face in Europe any competition.

It is convenient to separate these *Pan-European monopolistic industries* from the national industries protected by the customs barriers, to group them at the service of the Pan-European idea. The resistance from capitalism against the United States of Europe could be defeated by capitalism itself.

5. The Pan-European union

Pan-Europeans and anti-Europeans

To been able to appear some day in the European political map, Pan-Europa must root itself in the heart and in the mind of the Europeans, bridges of understanding must be erected, of interest and of friendship from people to people, from industry to industry, from syndicate to syndicate and from literature to literature. The Pan-European community sentiment, the *European patriotism*, must be the coronation and the complement of the national sentiment.

Europe cannot wait for their rulers and leaders of their political parties to recognize the need for their unity; all men and women that are convinced of the need of Pan-Europa, must put at the service of this work, from which result depends the destiny of a continent, the destiny of a culture.

No one is so useless to not been able to contribute somehow to the solution of the European problem. Can win supporters for the cause, can defend them, can deny their vote in the elections to that deputy that does not manifest clearly against the European anarchy and in favor of the Pan-European organization.

Through the oral and written agitation, the Pan-European question must be presented before the public opinion of all peoples as the *vital question of million of people*, until all the Europeans are forced to adopt a position about the subject.

It is necessary to make a clear separation between *Pan-Europeans and anti-Europeans*, between supporters and enemies of the federation. As soon as the Pan-Europeans reach the majority in every parliament of the continent, it will be secured the creation of Pan-Europa.

Pan-European union

To reach this goal, it will be born in all European States a movement and an organization whose irrevocable goal is the common constitution

of Pan-Europa: the *Pan-European* union.

The European youth is called to direct this movement: the youth of age and of mentality, a youth that does not want to be throw into the future war of gases by some politicians that are not capable anymore of changing their stiffen thinking.

The European women will unite the movement to avoid that their children and their husbands and themselves be the victims of the ambition of adventurer politicians.

The European spirit guides will support this movement because they know that the nationalist politics becomes in the undertaker of the European culture, which only can recover with the brotherhood of the European peoples.

All Europeans of good heart will abandon the policy of hate and envy, that has led Europe to the border of the abyss. They will enlist in mass to the European movement, because this advances in the realization of that that they have been dreaming for a long time.

Men and women from all classes will appear to make material and moral sacrifices for this great cause. Like the Pan-American movement that owes great part of its success to the magnanimity of *Carnegie*, the European “carnegies” will comply with their duty in front of Europe.

Once the Pan-European movement appears, will be fought the decisive combat for the destiny of Europe between the anti-Europeans and the Pan-Europeans, the combat between the past and the future, between the narrow views and the clairvoyance, between the barbarism and the culture.

The symbol that will unite the Pan-Europeans of all countries is the *solar cross: the red cross over the golden sun*, the symbol of *the humanity and the reason*.

This flag of love and of the spirit will wave one day from Portugal to Poland over an empire united in peace and freedom.

Annex

The man and the movement. A biographical outline of Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi

Born the 16th of November of 1894 in Tokyo, second son of Heinrich von Coudenhove, Austro-Hungarian writer and diplomat (1856 - 1906) [12], and Mitsu Aoyama, Japanese patrician (1874 - 1941), Richard spends his adolescence at the family dominions situated in the German Bohemia, in Rosperg, where the strong influence of his father, dead prematurely, has perpetuated an openness towards the cultures of the world. Finishes his school studies at the South Tirol (Episcopal school of Brixen/Bressanone), before entering as interne in the Theresianische Akademie of Vienna (1908 - 1913). In the eve of the war, begins his history of philosophy studies at the universities of Vienna and Munich and finish them in 1917 with a doctoral thesis with title “Die Objektivität ais Grundprinzip der Moral”, that was never edited.

[12] The count Heinrich decided in 1903 add to his patronymic the one of his mother, Maria Kalergi-Nesselrode (1840 - 1877), born from a family of Cretan and Norwegian origins that established for a long time in Russia.

The genealogists remark that the paternal ancestry goes back to a catholic lineage of North Brabant that acquired dominions in the Austrian empire during the XVIII century. The Ronsperg and Kunstadt lineage, promoted to the rank of count of the empire in 1790, received the title of citizen of Bavaria in 1816 and of citizen of Bohemia in 1842.

In April 1915, he marries Ida Roland (1881 - 1951), comedian actress that reaches then to the top of a theatrical carrier on the scenarios of Ulm, Dusseldorf, Munich, Vienna and Berlin (Max Reinhardt).

Cosigner, in November of 1918, of a declaration from the Council of the intellectual workers that is directed by the Berliner pacifist Kurt Hiller, Coudenhove makes him known within the intellectual circles of Germany and Austria as writer inscribed in the circles of the *Kulturkritiker*. Relying on the progress of the techniques, ponder on the conditions of civilization renewal, that, advertise for a new aristocracy of the spirit, would allow Europe reconquer the status of world power. Initiated in 1922 in the lodge *Humanitas* of Vienna, that abandoned right away, Coudenhove had for long time relations with diverse masonic milieus of Central Europe, France, England and the United States.

During that same year, the year of the most severe monetary, social and mental crisis known to the modern Austria, the young count exposes the elements of his conception for the relations between the five greatest continental spaces, conception elaborated following the trail of the projects drafted before the war by different writers, specifically the pacifist Austro-Hungarian Alfred Hermasnn Fried (1864 - 1921); with independence of Coudenhove, in Munich emerges, since 1920, a geopolitical analysis articulated under the impulse of the former officer Karl Haushofer.

The Pan-Europa project takes form definitively in the spring of 1923, when, retired in the Upper Austria at the Würting castle, Coudenhove redacts the one hundred and seventy pages in a sober and overwhelming tone: formulating the diagnostic of the European crisis, proposes a solution of great scope, whose justification examines in a perspective of evolution of the long term demographic, economic and military power. After this point, the word Pan-Europa, destined to have many meanings, designates a confederation of exclusively continental States, leaving the English and Russians with their respective imperial duties. For this reason, Coudenhove summons the Europeans to support an association that recently founded, the *Pan-European Union*, destined to favor the constitution of common institutions in matters of commerce, of money and foreign security, without forgetting the protection of minorities and the mediation of the differences between the confederated States.

To make known both the project and the subjects that served as a base, Coudenhove launches in April of 1924 the monthly publication *Pan-Europa*, published under an editorial with the same name that should make an effort of great dimensions. The activities are centered around two complementary axis: foment and organize a youth movement that would be framed in the national sections by support and promotion committees (writers, sages, musicians, lawyers, parliamentary journalists, former ministers); in parallel, it is of interest to obtain the support of political characters that exercise governmental responsibilities. Destined to evolve, the balance between the two fields of action gives to the president of the movement, supported by the chancellor Seipel and established in the Hofburg of Vienna, an important role as entertainer, lecturer and lobbyist that is going to define in Europe a half century of federalist propaganda.

The good times of the *Pan-European Union* advance in function of the relations that the president of the movement has with the governments and the milieus that can help for the realization of the project. The first three Congresses of the *Union* – Vienna, October of 1926; Berlin, May of 1930, and Basel, October 1932 – are inscribed in the trust for a long-term reconciliation between Germans and French. While the Plan Briand of the European Federal Union and the debates that this plan emanates define between 1929 and 1931 a first moment of success for the *Pan-European Union*, the count tends to privilege the mediator role, with the help of his friends inside the industrial and banking milieus from Germany, France and Central European countries, due to the increasing of the commercial, political and financial tensions presents growing difficulties, even before that the arriving of the Nazis to power precipitate a withdrawal from Austria of the *Union.*

Since then, the president of the movement put in first place a logic of national interest. Until the Anschluss, is going to second the efforts of the chancellors Dollfuss and Schuschnigg, not only in the diplomatic field but also in the internal politics questions (national identity, authoritarian reform of the State). Towards the end of 1937, the reduction of the Italian support for the country independence incites Coudenhove to revise one of his six strategical points of 1922, i.e. the role assigned to Great Britain in the European matters. Thinks, in fact,

that Great Britain should compromise more in such matters, despite of his links with the *Commonwealth*. The annexation of Austria to the Reich, that condemns Coudenhove to the exile, intervenes in a crucial moment of the evolution of his vision about the relations of strength between the European powers.

Czech citizen since 1920, becomes French natural citizen in the spring of 1939. Hostile to National Socialism because of the menace that means for Europe the reappearance of a Germany animated by a racial vision of the world, the exiled Coudenhove doubles his efforts giving conferences in Paris and London; in Bern and, after, at Geneva, designs a bulletin where comments, until June of 1940, the military and political current transformations. Before the defeat of France, he decides to leave again: in the middle of August, he travels to Lisbon in a plane going to New York.

The second crucial moment in his vision of the future of Europe produces at the beginning of his life in the United States. After an attempt to reunite all the monarchists and socialists Austrian exiled, with the perspective of a afterwar provisional government, Coudenhove proposes, since 1942, the creation of the United States of Europe with the help of a Supranational parliamentary assembly. In charge of a investigative seminary at the New York University about the afterwar European federation, organizes in May of 1943 the V Pan-European Congress: writers, university students and exiled political men agree to ponder on the federal structures of tomorrow. The constitution project approved by them in 1944 represents an important text within the ones that proliferate then in exile and in the resistance.

At the end of the conflict, Coudenhove has some support of considering in the Congress and in the American diplomacy. Since his first return to Europe in 1946, tries to consolidate the support that obtains in different political and intellectual milieus, specifically within the moderate socialists and the Christian-democrats from Belgium, Italy, France and Germany. The creation at Gstaad, in July of 1947, of a European parliamentary *Union*, composed by deputies coming from all liberal democratic countries, tries to promote the constitution of a parliamentary assembly that can invoke a supranational legitimacy. The Constitution project approved at Interlaken, in September of 1948,

gives a living impulse to the debates about the creation of a European Council. However, the modest attributions conferred by the London Statutes in May of 1949 to the new Assembly located at Strasbourg, contribute to reduce the followers of the *Union*, tired, in addition, by the internal dimensions. Since 1951, the governments of the Six constitute the initial Communities, over whose evolution the federal military organizations have practically any influence.

During the last two decades, Coudenhove dedicated relentlessly to give conferences, effort that was consecrated with prestigious awards, giving a constant support to the Fanco-German core of the community construction. In De Gaulle will find the personality that responds to the hope that he has been holding since the 1920's. If, on one side, he does not cease to renew the support full of admiration to the General, that goes back to the war years, the continuity of the subjects that had animated the confederal project of 1923, on the other side, contributes to the characterization of the Count position in front of the federalists militants from France, Belgium and Italy, totally opposed to the "Gaullist" vision of the European future.

Coudenhove dies at Schruns (Vorarlberg) the 27th of July of 1927 and is buried near Gstaad, at Gruben, population of the Bern Oberland, where he settled with his family in the summer of 1931.

In addition to the intellectual bibliographic and political works, there are many others encyclopedic articles that mark the path of Coudenhove-Kalergi: view in particular *Bibliographical Dictionary of Internationalists*, prepared by Warren F. Kuehl, Westport, Greenwoodpress, 1983, pp. 172-174; and *Biographisches Handbuch der deutschsprachigen Emigration nach 1933, Vol. I: Politik, Wirtschaft, öffentliches Leben,* prepared by Werner Röder and others, Munich, K.G. Saur, 1980, pp. 117-118.

The genealogy of this family of military men, travelers and high-level functionaries is easy to reconstruct with the help of the *Genealogiches Handbuch der gräflichen Häuser*, book A/III, prepared by Hans Friedrich von Ehrenkrook, Glücksburg, C.A., Starke Verlag, 1988, pp. 100-105, are found some precisions and some later elements.

Lubor Jílek

European Archives Foundation

Geneva, August of 1997